



27213.
a.
6190.

James H. Comfort.

Presented by his Father

1843.

YSAARU LUMIN
YTO 2420A
ON

B. B. Es.
\$ 2.71

2nd Series - Vol 11
1637
THE
NO

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1839.

VOL. XI.

PHILADELPHIA :

JAMES A. PEABODY, PROPRIETOR.

J. BOGART, PRINTER—PRINCETON.

WAGNER, JULIUS
VIO. 24244
OH.

PRINCETON REVIEW

THE REVIEW

1881

Vol. 1

THE REVIEW
OF THE
PRINCETON REVIEW

BIBLICAL REPERTORY.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

CONTENTS OF VOL. XI.

NO. I.

ART. I.—Life of Joseph Brant Thayendanegea: including the Border Wars of the American Revolution, and Sketches of the Indian Campaigns of Generals Harmar, St. Clair, and Wayne, and other matters connected with the Indian Relations of the United States and Great Britain, from the Peace of 1783 to the Indian Peace of 1785. By William L. Stone,	1
ART. II.—Bible Class Manual: or a System of Theology, in the order of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, adapted to Bible Classes. By John M'Dowell, D. D., Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia,	31
ART. III.—1. Elements of Psychology, included in a Critical Examination of Locke's Essay on the Human understanding, with Additional Pieces. By Victor Cousin, Peer of France, Member of the Royal Council of Public Instruction, Member of the Institute, and Professor of the History of Ancient Philosophy in the Faculty of Literature. Translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. C. S. Henry, D.D.	
2. Introduction to the History of Philosophy. By Victor Cousin, Professor of Philosophy of the Faculty of Literature at Paris. Translated from the French, by Henning Gottfried Linberg.	
3. An Address delivered before the Senior Class in Divinity College, Cambridge, Sunday, 15th July, 1838. By Ralph Waldo Emerson.	37.
ART. IV.—Fragments from the study of a Pastor, By Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the City of New-York.	102
ART. V.—General History of Civilization in Europe, from the fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. Translated from the French of M. Guizot, Professor of History to La Faculté des Lettres of Paris, and Minister of Public Instruction.	114
Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets,	142

NO. II.

ART. I.—1. The Chinese : A General Description of the Empire of China and its inhabitants. By John Francis Davis, Esq., F.R.S. &c.	
2. The Stranger in China ; or, The Fan-qui's visit to the Celestial Empire in 1836—7. By C. Toogood Downing, Esq., Member of Royal College of Surgeons.	
3. China ; its State and Prospects, with especial reference to the spread of the gospel ; containing allusions to the Antiquity, Extent, Population, Civilization, Literature, and Religion of the Chinese. By W. H. Medhurst, of the London Missionary Society,	147
ART. II.—Claims of the Gospel Ministry to an Adequate Support. An Address of the Presbytery of Elizabethtown to the Churches under its care,	180
ART. III.—The Scripture Guide ; a Familiar Introduction to the Study of the Bible. Prepared for the American Sunday School Union, and revised by the Committee of Publication,	201
ART. IV.—Mammon or Covetousness the Sin of the Christian Church. By the Rev. John Harris.	
2. Anti-Mammon : or an Exposure of the Unscriptural Statements of Mammon, with a Statement of True Doctrine as maintained by sound Divines, and derived from Holy Scripture. By two Clergymen,	222
ART. V.—Memoirs of Mrs. Hawkes, late of Islington ; including, Remarks in Conversation and Extracts from Sermons and Letters of the late Rev. Richard Cecil. By Catharine Cecil,	239
ART. VI.—Notes Critical and Practical, on the Book of Genesis ; Designed as a General Help to Biblical Reading and Instruction. By George Bush, Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature, New York City University,	271
Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets,	302

NO. III.

ART. I.—Concordantiæ Librorum Veteris Testamenti Sacrorum Hebraicæ atque Chaldaicæ, &c. &c. Auctore Julio Fürstio, Doct., Phil. Lipsiæ,	305
ART. II.—The Life of John Calvin, the Great Reformer. By Paul Henry, D.D.	339
ART. III.—A Brief History and Vindication of the Doctrines received and established in the Churches of New England, with a specimen	

of the New Scheme of Religion beginning to prevail. By Thomas Clap, A.M., President of Yale College, - - -	389
ART. IV.—Sermons by the late Rev. Edward D. Griffin, D.D. To which is prefaced a Memoir of his life. By William B. Sprague, D.D. Minister of the second Presbyterian Congregation in Albany, - - - - -	404
ART. V.—General Assembly of 1839, - - - - -	416
Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets, - - - - -	449

NO. IV.

ART. I.—1. The Intermediate State: a Sermon by the Rev. Reuben Sherwood of Hyde Park.	
2. No Intermediate Place: a Sermon delivered in the Reformed Dutch Church in Hyde Park, N. Y. by the Rev. William Cruikshanks, - - - - -	453
ART. II.—Ancient Fragments of the Phœnician, Chaldaean, Egyptian, Tyrian, Carthaginian, Indian, Persian, and other writers; with an Introductory Dissertation: and an Inquiry into the Philosophy and Trinity of the Ancients. By Isaac Preston Cory, Esq., Fellow of Caius Coll. Cambridge, - - -	479
ART. III.—Travels in South Eastern Asia, embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam and China, with Notices of Numerous Missionary Stations, and a full account of the Burman Empire, with Dissertations, Tables, &c. By Howard Malcom, - - -	494
ART. IV.—1. The present Conflict between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts Examined, with Historical and Statutory Evidence for the Jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland. By the Rev. Andrew Gray, A.M.	
2. Substance of a Speech delivered in the General Assembly, on Wednesday, the 22d of May, 1839, respecting the Decision of the House of Lords, on the Case of Auchterarder. By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. LL.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburg, and Corresponding Member of the Royal Institute of France.	
3. Speeches of the Rev. D. Burns, Rev. Robert S. Candish, and Alexander Earle Monteith, Esq., in the General Assembly, on May 22, 1839, in the Auchterarder Case. With an appendix, 510	
ART. V.—A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language, containing the Accentuation—the Grammatical Inflections—the irregular words referred to their themes—the parallel terms from the other Gothic languages—the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon in English and Latin—and copious English and Latin Indexes, serving as	

a Dictionary of English and Anglo-Saxon, as well as of Latin and Anglo Saxon. With a Preface on the Origin and Connexion of the Germanic tongues—a Map of Languages, and the Essentials of Anglo-Saxon Grammar. By the Rev. J. Bosworth, L.L.D. Dr. Phil. Leyden; B. D. of Trinity College, Cambridge, &c. &c., British Chaplain at Rotterdam, - 527

ART. VII.—Decretum Synodi Nationalis Ecclesiarum Reformatarum Gallicae initio Anni 1645, de imputatione primi peccati omnibus Adami posteris, cum Ecclesiarum et Doctorum Protestantium consensu, ex scriptis eorum, ab Andrea Riveto collecto, - 553

ART. VII.—Moral Machinery Simplified. A Discourse delivered at Andover, Mass. July 4th, 1839. By Parsons Cooke, Pastor of the First Church in Lynn, - - - - - 572

ART. VIII.—Obligations of the World to the Bible: A Series of Lectures to Young Men. By Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, in the city of New York, - - - 585

ART. IX.—Letters to the Rev. Professor Stuart, comprising Remarks on his Essay on Sin, published in the American Biblical Repository, for April and July 1839. By Daniel Dana, D.D. minister of the Gospel in Newbury Port, - - - - - 584

Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets, - - - - - 597

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY 1839.

No. I.

ART. I.—*Life of Joseph Brant Thayendanegea: including the Border Wars of the American Revolution, and Sketches of the Indian Campaigns of Generals Har-mar, St. Clair, and Wayne, and other matters connected with the Indian Relations of the United States and Great Britain, from the Peace of 1783 to the Indian Peace of 1795.* By William L. Stone. 2 vols. 8vo. Dearborn: New York. 1838.

IT was a matter of surprise to us, at first, to find two ponderous volumes occupied with the life of an Indian chief; but upon perusal, we found that the hero of the history takes up a small space in the body of the work. He is, it is true, a prominent actor in the transactions recorded in these volumes; but if they contained nothing more than the events in which Joseph Brant was personally concerned, they would be of small value compared with that which they intrinsically possess. The fact is, that the American public are indebted to Col. Stone, for an entirely new history of the war of the revolution. This history is not only new as being composed in a lively style, and as containing much graphic description of interesting scenes by an original writer; but by means of new sources of information, and authentic documents, not possessed by any former historian, the author has presented

many of the events of the war under a new aspect; and has been able to bring into view many transactions of stirring, and sometimes tragical interest, of which the public have hitherto received no authentic information.

The military operations of the Indians on our borders, it is known to all, formed a very important part of the revolutionary war; but until now, our accounts of these transactions have been meagre, and in many instances, not sufficiently authenticated. But in these volumes this great desideratum in our history has been supplied; and if it had been neglected a little longer, the work never could have been satisfactorily accomplished, as many of the richest sources of information would have been inaccessible. Especially would this have been the case in regard to the testimony of aged men, who were witnesses, and frequently actors, in the scenes which they have described. The history, as it relates to the Indian wars in the north and north west, seems to be complete, but the same cannot be said respecting those of the south west. Of the numerous tribes in this quarter, the author gives, occasionally, a passing notice; but a full and authentic account of the hostile movements of the Cherokees, Creeks, and Choctaws, during the revolutionary war, is still a desideratum; which we hope some qualified person will supply, before the sources of authentic information are entirely beyond our reach. To show how soon this will be the case, we mention a single fact. We received from two different persons, who had a knowledge of all the transactions, a particular narrative of the fierce and bloody war waged with the Cherokees, in the years 1777, 1778, 1779, the seat of which was the country on the head waters of the Tennessee, now denominated East Tennessee. Both these persons have died within a few years, one of them, whose information was exact, no longer ago than last year. It is not known to us that any history of the events of this war has been given to the public. And the same may be said of the hostilities of the Creeks and Choctaws; for as for the Chickasaws, it has ever been their boast, that they have never shed the blood of a white man.

It gives us much pleasure to remark, that the historian is careful to designate his authorities, whether living or dead; and also that he has exercised an impartial, independent judgment, in regard to persons and things: and, in our opinion, has often succeeded in dispelling the clouds which prejudice and misrepresentation had spread over certain char-

acters and transactions. He has vindicated the Indian race from undeserved obloquy, as it regards their mode of warfare: and he has not shielded from merited reproach, men who, under the name of civilization and Christianity, have been guilty of deeds of cold blooded cruelty, at which even the savages stood aghast. If in any thing there is a semblance of prejudice, it relates to those called Tories; and our only reason for supposing that even here there is any partiality is, that the description of their cruelties and faithlessness, is without mitigation or apology.

To some readers it may appear to have been unnecessary, in the history of the Indian wars on our borders, to introduce all the leading events of the revolution; but a little consideration will convince such, that without some comprehensive view of the whole, the parts can never be correctly understood: all the military transactions of that period of our history have an intimate relation to one another; and the succinct mention of the principal transactions of this eventful war, in their proper time and place, greatly relieves the monotony, which must have existed in a continuous narrative of the invasions of savages and Tories.

Although, then, we have found this work to be very different from what we expected; yet our disappointment has been of the agreeable kind. These volumes must be considered a very important part of the history of a country which seems destined, in providence, to be one of the most remarkable and populous that ever existed. Extracts from this work, such as we could insert in this article, would be unsatisfactory. Every American, who takes an interest in the history of his country, will choose to peruse the whole. It may, however, be gratifying to one class of our readers, to give a brief sketch of the life of Joseph Brant, the principal hero of the story.

This remarkable man was born on the banks of the Ohio, in the year 1742; although the proper residence of his parents was at Canajoharie Castle—the central castle of the Mohawks. His father was a sachem in his tribe. Of his early youth nothing remarkable is known; except that when only thirteen years of age, he joined the warriors of his tribe under Sir William Johnson, and was present at the memorable battle of Lake George, in which the French were defeated, and their commander mortally wounded. Two of his brothers, older than himself, were also engaged in this war. “The youthful warrior likewise accompanied

Sir William during the Niagara campaign of 1759; and in the brilliant achievements of the Baronet, after the chief command had devolved upon him, by the death of General Prideaux, is said to have acquitted himself with distinguished bravery." On this occasion the French, under Monsieur D'Aubrey, were defeated with great loss. The Indians behaved uncommonly well, and Brant was among them. At this time, the Rev. Mr. Kirkland, a graduate of Nassau Hall, was stationed as a missionary among the Mohawks, through whose influence Sir William Johnson was induced to select a certain number of young Indians of the Mohawk tribe, to be sent to the "Moor Charity School," at Lebanon, Connecticut, which was under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Eleazer Wheelock, afterwards the founder and president of Dartmouth college. Indeed, the aforesaid school was the foundation of this college. Among those selected was Joseph Brant; and the Baronet's partiality for him can readily be accounted for, when it is known that after the death of his first wife, he had taken into his house, and ever treated as a wife, the sister of this young man; familiarly known at that time by the name of "Miss Molly."

The precise year in which he was placed under the charge of Dr. Wheelock cannot be ascertained; but it was probably about 1761. It has been asserted, that he did not remain long at the school, and while there did not make much proficiency in learning. However that may be, it is certain that the Rev. Charles Jeffrey Smith, a missionary to the Mohawks, took Brant as an interpreter, in 1762, and gave him an excellent character; from which it may be inferred that his scholarship was not so contemptible as has been alleged. His teacher, also, in his memoirs, says, "Sir Wm. Johnson, superintendent of Indian affairs, was very friendly to the design of Mr. Wheelock, and at his request sent to the school, at various times, several of the Mohawks to be instructed. One of them was the since celebrated Joseph Brant; *who, after receiving his education*, was particularly noticed by Sir William Johnson, and employed by him in public business. He has been very useful in civilizing his countrymen, and for a long time past has been a military officer of extensive influence among the Indians in Upper Canada." This school seems to have been instituted expressly for the education of promising youths of the aborigines; and this also was the original and professed object of the college of Dartmouth. Of all the boys who were sent to the

school at Lebanon, only two had patience to continue at study until they were graduated.

The exigencies of the frontier did not allow Brant to remain long associated in the mission with Mr. Smith. In one of the Rev. Mr. Kirkland's earliest reports, the following paragraph appears, "Joseph Brant, a Mohawk Indian, and of a family of distinction in the nation, was educated by Dr. Wheelock, and was so well accomplished, that the Rev. Charles Jeffrey Smith (a young man who out of love to Christ, and the souls of men, devotes his life, and such a fortune as is sufficient to support himself and an interpreter, wholly to this glorious work) took him for his interpreter, when he went on a mission to the Mohawks, some three years ago. But the war breaking out, at that time, between the back Indians and the English, Mr. Smith was obliged to return; but Joseph tarried and went out with a company against the Indians, and was useful in the war; in which he behaved so much like the Christian and the soldier, that he gained great esteem. He now lives in a decent manner, and endeavours to teach his poor brethren the things of God, in which his own heart seems much engaged. His house is an asylum for the missionaries in that wilderness." From this war, young Brant returned early in the spring of 1764. In 1765, Brant, having been previously married to the daughter of an Oneida chief, was settled at Canajoharie, as appears by a letter from the Rev. Theophilus Chamberlain, one of the missionaries to the Six Nations, dated July 17th, of this year, in which he says, "I am now at Joseph Brant's house, very poorly with the dysentery, which hath followed me near a week. Riding in the rain sometimes, wading through tracks to get along, and lodging on the cold ground the other night, have made me almost down sick: but my business keeps me alive. Joseph Brant is exceeding kind."

Three years afterwards he was still leading a peaceable life, at the same place, as appears by an entry in the journal of Mr. Ralph Wheelock, who had been sent to Oneida, to relieve Mr. Kirkland, who was sick.

"March 16, 1766. At my old friend Joseph Brant's, I met one of the chiefs of the Onondagas (who is, by way of eminence, called the wise-man) on his return to his tribe, with his wife and child; and by Joseph Brant's help, I was able to discourse with him, and delivered my message to his nation." During the next three years, no information has been received of Brant's manner of life. As the country

was at peace; however, he was probably leading a life of repose at home; except when commissioned by Sir William to transact business with the Indians. It is not improbable, however, that he was at this period connected with the Episcopal missions to the Mohawks, which had been commenced, as early as 1702, and continued down to the beginning of the revolutionary war. Having been employed by one of the missionaries as an interpreter before; and as the Rev. Dr. Ogilvie, the predecessor of Dr. Barclay in that mission, was engaged, in 1767, in preparing the Mohawk Prayer Book, it is highly probable that Brant may have been employed as an assistant in that labour; since he was partial to exercises of that description.

In the year 1771, the Rev. Mr. Stewart conducted a school at Fort Hunter; a venerable friend of the author of the history now under review, living at Albany, was at that time a pupil in Dr. Stewart's school, and had frequent opportunities of seeing Brant, and formed an acquaintance, which, interrupted only by the war of the revolution, continued until the death of the warrior. He there formed an excellent opinion of the young chief in regard to talents and good disposition; and it is his opinion, that at this time, he was much employed at home by the Baronet, in the discharge of the multifarious duties incident to his important official station. He was also frequently sent upon distant embassies among the western tribes, and his talents and tact, as a diplomatist of the forest, were qualities pertaining to his character through life.

Thayendanegea was thrice married; having been twice a widower before the war of the revolution. His first two wives were of the Oneida tribe. Dr. Stewart says, that he first became acquainted with him in 1771. He was still residing at Canajoharie, on visiting which village, he found him comfortably settled in a good house, with every thing necessary for the use of his family. At that time his wife was sick of the consumption, and died soon afterwards. He had then but two children, a son and a daughter. After the death of his wife, he repaired to Fort Hunter, and resided with the Rev. Dr. Stewart, who was then engaged in another revision of the Indian Prayer Book, in which work Joseph assisted him.

He applied to Dr. Stewart in 1772-3 to marry him to his deceased wife's half sister, but the divine refused, on the ground of its being a forbidden relationship. Brant, how-

ever, vindicated the lawfulness of such a connexion and got a German ecclesiastic to perform the ceremony.

It was about this period of his life that Brant was brought under serious impressions of religion, and attached himself to the Episcopal church. From his serious deportment, and the anxiety he had ever manifested to civilize and Christianize his people, great hopes were entertained of his future usefulness in the cause. At this time he gave every evidence of sincerity in his profession; but his continual engagement in scenes of war after this, it must be confessed, greatly effaced these deep impressions of religion. Still his religious principles were not entirely eradicated, as is manifest from his future life.

In conformity with a custom prevalent among the Indians he, at this time, selected a bosom friend, a lieutenant Provost, a half-pay officer residing in the Mohawk valley. Those unacquainted with Indian usages, are not probably aware of the intimacy of this relationship, or of the importance attached to it. The selected friend is, in fact, the counterpart of him who chooses him; and the attachment often becomes romantic. They share each other's secrets, and are participants of each other's joys and sorrows. In this case, however, the pleasures and advantages expected from friendship, were not realized: for lieutenant Provost was ordered to his regiment, and on foreign service, greatly to the regret of the Indian chief. His grief at this separation was so deep, that Doctor Stewart advised him to select another friend, offering himself as a substitute; but the young chief declared that such a transfer of his affections was impossible; for he was Capt. John's friend, and two such friends could not be in existence at the same time. As a testimony and memorial of his inviolable friendship, he procured and sent to lieutenant Provost, to the West Indies, an entire Indian costume, of the richest furs he could obtain.

The Shawanese, in the year 1774, being spread along the Ohio river from Wheeling as far south as the borders of Kentucky, frequent acts of murder and robbery were committed, both by the savages on the frontier settlements of white people, and as frequently by a set of white people on the Indians, who even exceeded the red sons of the forest in the atrocity of their acts. According to the author of this history, the fierce and bloody war which now commenced between the Virginians and the Shawanese and their auxiliaries, was provoked by the outrages of Col. Cresap, Daniel

Greathouse, and one Tomlinson, and by the murder of the Indian chief Bald Eagle, who spent much of his time among the whites. But it is not our purpose to go into an inquiry respecting the causes of this war, and the culpability of the parties respectively. We shall do no more than merely notice the battle of the Point, as it is called, in Virginia, because fought very near Point Pleasant, where the Great Kanhawa forms a junction with the Ohio. General Andrew Lewis commanded the Virginians in this engagement. His troops were all riflemen, principally collected from the great valley west of the Blue Ridge; and many of them were among the most respectable men of that country. The plan of the campaign, according to which Governor Dunmore was to have co-operated with Gen. Lewis, was, for some cause not ascertained, entirely defeated. To reach the Point, Gen. Lewis had to march his men for one hundred and sixty miles through a trackless wilderness, and over lofty mountains. The Indians, consisting of Shawanese, Delawares, Mingoës, Wyandots, and Cayugas, have been variously stated to have numbered from six hundred to fifteen hundred men; and were commanded by the great Shawanese chief Cornstock, by his son Ellenipsico, and the Red Eagle. The battle occurred early in the morning of the 10th of October, and continued hot until afternoon, and with short intervals until night. Col. Charles Lewis commanded the right wing of the Virginians, which was in advance of the rest of the forces, and was shot dead early in the day. Thus fell a brave man in the flower of his youth. The Virginians, like the Indians, sought every advantage by fighting from the shelter of trees and bushes. The left wing was commanded by Col. Flemming, who was also severely wounded early in the engagement, having received two balls through his arm, and one in his breast; but he continued, notwithstanding, to encourage his men, urging them not to lose an inch of ground, but to out-flank the enemy. The onset of the Indians at this time was so impetuous, that two regiments appeared to be giving way on the right; and now on the left some indications of the same thing was apparent, when Col. Field's regiment was brought with great spirit into the action, by which seasonable movement, the fortunes of the day were retrieved. The Indians seem to have singled out the general officers; for Col. Field, at the very moment when he had given a favourable turn to the battle, was shot dead on the field; and was succeeded by Capt. Isaac Shelby, afterwards the brave and

hardy old governor of Kentucky; famous in Indian warfare even to old age. The Indians, though checked and in some measure driven back, made a valiant stand, at their breast-work, until near night. The attacks of the Virginians on this breast-work seemed to have no other effect than to weaken their own forces, already much exhausted. Three companies were detached, under Capt. Shelby, to endeavour to get into the rear of the Indians. The ground and the tall weeds favoured the enterprise, so that these companies passed the enemies flank without being observed; and falling vigorously on their rear, drove them from their lines with precipitation. It being night, and the Indians supposing that a reinforcement had arrived, fled across the Ohio, and continued their retreat to the Scioto. The exact loss of the Indians was never known: the Virginians scalped twenty. Their own loss was severe; among whom were two colonels, four captains, and many subordinate officers; and about fifty or sixty privates; besides a much larger number wounded. The Indians, when they reached Chillicothe, held a council to determine whether they should continue the war or sue for peace. After some discussion, the latter was determined on: and in a short time the war was ended.

Cornstock was at first in favour of continuing the war, but when he found the leading men of the tribe reluctant to enter the conflict again, he immediately declared in favour of peace, and accordingly a treaty was made at Chillicothe, which the Shawanese had, for some time past, made their chief residence. He now became very much the friend of the colonies; and while the more northern tribes were engaging in the contest in favour of the British, this distinguished chief resisted all solicitations to join the confederacy. And as the Virginians had erected a fort at Point Pleasant, he seemed to take pleasure in visiting the place, where he was treated with much kindness and respect by Capt. Arbuckle, the commanding officer. It was when he and his son Ellenipsico were on a friendly visit to the fort, that both of them were cruelly murdered by the whites, in a time of profound peace, and when they entertained not the slightest apprehension of danger; under the following lamentable circumstances. As he frankly admitted that he should be unable to prevent his tribe from joining the Indians of New York, it was judged expedient to detain him, and a Delaware chief, named Redhawk, who had accompanied him to the fort, as hostages for the good behaviour of his tribe. Nor did they remain un-

willingly, little suspecting the tragical end which awaited them. His son had not gone with Cornstock, and not knowing how to account for his father's long delay, went to the Point to look after him. Unfortunately the day after the arrival of the young warrior at Point Pleasant, two white men having crossed the Kanhawa on a hunting expedition, were fired upon by some straggling Indians, and one of them, whose name was Gilmore, was killed. The other escaped. No sooner was the event of Gilmore's death known, than the cry of revenge was raised, and a party of ruffians, under the command of Capt. Hall, assembled—not to pursue and punish the perpetrators of the murder, but to fall upon the peaceable and friendly Indians in the fort. Arming themselves, and cocking their rifles, they proceeded directly to the little garrison, menacing death to any who should oppose their nefarious designs. A friend of the hostage chiefs attempted to apprize them of their danger: but the savage mob was too close upon their heels to allow of their escape. At the sound of the clamour without, Ellenipsico appeared to be somewhat agitated. Not so the veteran Cornstock. He had too often grappled with death on the war-path to fear his approaches now. Perceiving the emotion of his son, he calmly said, "*My son, the Great Spirit has seen fit that we should die together, and has sent you to that end. It is his will, and let us submit.*" The infuriated mob had now gained the apartment of the victims. Cornstock fell, perforated with seven bullets, and died without a struggle. The son, after the exhortation of his father, met his fate with composure, and was shot upon the seat on which he was sitting. Redhawk, the young Delaware, died with less fortitude. Another friendly Indian, in the fort at the time, was killed, and his body mangled by the barbarians in a manner that would have disgraced savages of any other complexion. "Thus," says an Indian chronicler, "perished the mighty Cornstock, sachem of the Shawanese, and king of the northern confederacy, in 1774—a chief remarkable for many great and good qualities. He was disposed to be, at all times, the friend of white men, as he was ever the advocate of honourable peace. But when his country's wrongs summoned him to the battle, he became the thunder-bolt of war, and made his enemies feel the weight of his arm. His noble bearing, his generous and disinterested attachment to the colonies, his anxiety to preserve the frontier of Virginia from desolation and death, all conspired to win

for him the respect and esteem of others; while the untimely and perfidious manner of his death caused a deep and lasting feeling of regret to pervade the bosoms even of those who were enemies to his nation, and excited the just indignation of all towards his inhuman murderers.”

As it is our object to furnish to our readers some specimens of the high learning and noble character of some of the aborigines of this country, we will now give some account of another chief of the Shawanese, who is not mentioned in this history of Brant, but who was a distinguished leader in all the wars which this tribe carried on with the whites for more than half a century. We refer to Black Hoof, whose Indian name is Cata He Cassa. In the splendid work now in a course of publication in Philadelphia, entitled, “History of the Indian Tribes of North America, with Biographical Sketches of the principal Chiefs—embellished with one hundred and twenty portraits, copied from the Indian gallery, in the department of war, at Washington,” we have a biographical sketch of this famous warrior, accompanied by a striking portrait. He was present with his tribe in the battle in which Braddock was defeated and killed, in 1755; and it is asserted that Black Hoof was engaged in every battle fought by his tribe until the treaty of Greenville, in 1795. His fame as a warrior was very great; and he was also distinguished as an orator in his tribe. Col. Johnson, of Pequea, describes him to have been the most graceful Indian he ever saw. His stature, however, was moderate, about five feet, eight inches. He never had more than one wife, and was always opposed to the practice of tormenting prisoners. When he found that all the efforts of the Indians against the whites must be ineffectual, he became favourable to peace, and gave his consent to the treaty of Greenville.

When Tecumsee and his brother the prophet rose into notice in the tribe, Black Hoof was highest in authority. This new chief equalled, or excelled him in talents, but was of different politics. Tecumsee, actuated by a lofty ambition, thirsted for opportunities of distinguishing himself. And when, by the instigation of the British, a new war was enkindled, he engaged in it with ardour. His brother, the prophet, a deceitful man, had great influence with his tribe, in exciting them to war, by his pretended revelations. But Black Hoof continued firm in his adherence to the treaty of peace; and, through his influence, the best part of the nation were restrained from engaging in the war; but the younger

men, and the lower sort, were led on by Tecumsec, and suffered much in the end, in consequence.

Black Hoof lived to extreme old age. When ninety years old he shot a deer; and survived until the year 1831, when, it is supposed, that he was considerably above a hundred years of age; probably a hundred and twelve.

Many years ago we recollect to have heard from a gentleman of intelligence, a particular account of a visit paid to Col. Lewis, when he was at Point Pleasant, by a very aged chief of the Shawanese tribe; conjectured at that time to be more than a hundred years old. The old chief could by no means be induced to cross the Ohio, but pitched his tent on the shore opposite to Point Pleasant, and remained there for several weeks; receiving frequent visits from Col. Lewis, and communicating to him many interesting facts respecting his own history and that of his tribe. Although the name of this old chief was not mentioned, yet we cannot doubt that he was no other than Black Hoof. And this opinion is confirmed by the coincidence between the history which he gave of the migrations of the Shawanese, and that which is found in the biographical sketch of Black Hoof in the work before mentioned. These accounts agree in saying that this tribe had resided on the Gulf of Mexico, and migrated to the Delaware shortly before Penn received the grant of Pennsylvania. The old chief who visited Col. Lewis, said that he distinctly remembered when the first log house was built in the city of Lancaster. When the settlement of the whites approached too near, the Shawanese retreated first to the Cumberland valley; next they crossed the Alleghany mountains, and fixed their residence on the Ohio, near Pittsburg; where they resided at the time of Braddock's defeat. Afterwards they passed down the Ohio to the Little Kanhawa; then to the Great Kanhawa; and finally to Chilicothe on the Scioto; where they continued until defeated by Wayne. By these incessant wars with the whites, and by other causes, this tribe, once powerful, is now reduced to a small number; and will soon, in all probability, cease to exist as a separate tribe. A few of them still remain on the Indian reservation north of the Ohio, and a remnant have migrated to the "Western Territory," beyond the Mississippi.

It is time now that we should return to Capt. Brant; but our narrative has already swelled to such a size, that we must pass very rapidly over the many important transactions in which he acted a conspicuous part, during the war of the re-

volution, and after its close. Indeed, these transactions are so implicated with the whole history of the war, as carried on in the western parts of New York and Pennsylvania, that in order to obtain a satisfactory view of his course, and of the important part which he acted, it will be necessary for the reader to peruse the full and particular detail of events as recorded in the history, and we can promise that he will not lose his labour, or regret the time which will be occupied in turning over these pages. With these views, therefore, we shall condense, within a brief space, all that we shall yet say of this distinguished chief; selecting only a few of the more remarkable transactions in which Brant was engaged as a prime agent.

The Americans were fully aware of the influence of the sachem of the Mohawks both over his own tribe and over the other tribes associated with it; and they were not remiss in using endeavours to secure the friendship of this important man on the side of the colonies, in the approaching contest. The provincial congress of Massachusetts, before the affair of Lexington, addressed a letter to the Rev. Mr. Kirkland, the faithful missionary of the Oneidas, to use his influence with the Six Nations, and with the sachem of the Mohawk tribe, to prevent their taking an active part in favour of the mother country. The Americans, at first, aimed at nothing more in regard to the Indians than to keep them in a state of strict neutrality between the contending parties. But the close connexion between Brant and the Johnsons frustrated all efforts of this kind. At the commencement of hostilities, Brant was secretary to Guy Johnson, the British superintendent of Indian affairs; and as both he and Sir John Johnson, the son and heir of Sir William, engaged with extraordinary zeal in opposition to the colonies, it was very natural for Brant to be carried away by their influence and example. We find him, therefore, at an early period of the war, exerting himself with great effect in exciting hostile feelings in the minds of the Indian tribes, and in making hostile incursions into the white settlements. His power and influence was about this time greatly augmented by being constituted the head and principal chief of the confederated tribes of the Six Nations. Although this high office was elective, yet the choice of a chief was, by usage, always made out of the Mohawk tribe.

About the close of the year 1775, Brant, accompanied by Capt. Tice, sailed for England, where he remained only a

few months; but he staid long enough to form an intimate friendship with some distinguished noblemen, and to become more fully confirmed and decided in his adherence to the royal cause, in the contest which had now become inevitable.

Brant's return to America was early in 1776, soon after which he was present in the battle of the Cedars, and after the surrender of Capt. Sherburne, exerted himself successfully to restrain the Indians, and prevent the massacre of the prisoners. All the American officers concerned in this engagement and shameful surrender, fell under the severe censure of Washington and of the public.

In the year 1777, General Herkimer, an old friend and neighbour of Brant, marched with a considerable force into the region of Brant's residence, and sought a friendly interview with the chief; which took place on middle ground between the Indians and Herkimer's forces, in the presence of only a few attendants. All Herkimer's arguments to bring over the Indian chief to the side of the Americans, were unavailing; and also his efforts to induce him to surrender certain Tories, who were under the protection of the Indians. Herkimer, on this occasion, disgraced himself and the cause which he wished to promote. For when the first day's conference broke up rather abruptly, the Indians, suspecting some treachery, retiring, seized their rifles, and raised the war whoop. Great pains were now taken to convince Brant that no evil was intended; and a proposal was made and urged to meet Herkimer the next day. In the morning, Gen. Herkimer gave express orders to Capt. Wagoner and three others, as soon as Brant and his companions came to the meeting, to shoot them down. Nothing can be conceived more cruel and dishonourable than such an order; and if it were not too well authenticated, it would be incredible. This bloody treachery was only hindered from being carried into effect by the prudent foresight of Brant; who, suspecting some evil, took effectual measures to prevent a surprise.

In May of this year (1777) Brant collected some forces and made an incursion into Cherry Valley. The people had formed to themselves a sort of fort around the house of Col. Samuel Campbell, and the boys were exercising and parading on the esplanade in front of the house, when Brant and his Indians unexpectedly came in sight; and from a hill at the distance of a mile, he surveyed the fort, and the juvenile company on parade, which led him to suppose that his force was insufficient to carry a place apparently so strongly fortified;

therefore he led off his men to a lurking place near the road leading to the Mohawk river. A young man named lieutenant Wormwood, had been sent to inform the inhabitants that a detachment of Col. Klock's regiment was to march to their defence the following day; this young man who belonged to one of the most opulent families of the Palatine, when on his return, accompanied by a young man, passed near the place where the Indians lay concealed, and when he came up they shot him, and Capt. Brant scalped him with his own hands. Upon ascertaining who the young man was, the chief was much grieved, for he had been not only an old acquaintance, but a friend. He was fired upon, on the supposition that he was an officer of the continental army.

The siege of Fort Stanwix, or Schuyler, as it was afterwards called, is one of the most memorable events of the war, with which Brant had a personal connexion. General Gansevoort, with about seven hundred and fifty men, defended this fortress, and had provisions for only about six weeks. Col. St. Leger commanded the royalists, who laid siege to the fort, and Capt. Brant the Indians. Col. Marinus Willet, with his regiment, was directed to join the garrison. The besieging army under St. Leger, including Indians, consisted of more than seventeen hundred men. General Herkimer, as soon as he heard of the siege of Fort Schuyler, endeavoured to arouse the militia of Tyron county. The people seemed to have dismissed their fears which had so lately seized them, and discovered now a readiness to come forward to the assistance of their distressed countrymen. They therefore rallied round the standard of Gen. Herkimer, and appeared eager to be led on against the enemy. Indeed, their alacrity was so great, that they went forward in their march with very little order: and when the general expressed a doubt whether it was safe to advance farther, until they received a reinforcement, some of his principal officers considered it a mark of cowardice, and declared their determination to push on. But they had not proceeded more than two or three miles, before the vanguard were shot down, by an invisible foe. The fact was, that Col. St. Leger, having heard of the approach of Gen. Herkimer, had sent the Indians, under Brant, and a number of select companies of Rangers and Greens to ambuscade the army of Herkimer on its way. Brant had chosen his ground with consummate judgment, stationing his men in almost a circle, leaving open a narrow pass for the provincials to enter. The effect of this stratagem was, that

nearly the whole force of Herkimer was surrounded, before he was aware of the presence of an enemy. His men were by the suddenness of the attack and the concealment of the enemy, who fired from beneath thick bushes and from behind trees, thrown into great disorder, and early in the battle the general himself was severely wounded, having one of his legs shattered; but causing himself to be rested against a tree, he continued to issue his commands, in the midst of the thickest of the battle, with the most perfect firmness and composure. The destruction of the provincials was dreadful, until forming themselves into circles, they were more successful in repelling the furious attacks of the savage foe. Just at this time the battle was interrupted by a heavy shower of rain, which raged with fury for an hour. During this suspension, the provincials took the opportunity of gaining a more favourable piece of ground. About this time a firing was heard in the direction of the fort; and upon the appearance of the men, they seemed to be a reinforcement for the provincials; but it was soon discovered that they were enemies in the guise of friends. Capt. Gardinier, who was first to detect the true character of these forces, attacked them with incredible ardour, and with his own hands slew several of the foremost; and his men, stimulated by his example, performed prodigies of valour on that occasion. The Indians now began to give way, and the Greens and Rangers retired towards the fort, where it was understood that their assistance was needed. This was undoubtedly one of the severest conflicts which took place during the revolutionary war. Both parties suffered severely, but the provincials kept possession of the ground. The brave general was carried off in a litter. Never did a man give fuller evidence of true courage than Herkimer on this occasion. The Indians murdered a few of the prisoners, and more would have fallen a sacrifice to their cruelty, had they not been restrained by their officers. Two brothers were on this day engaged on opposite sides. Major Frey, on the side of the provincials, was wounded and taken prisoner; when his own brother, who was among the loyalists, made the attempt to murder him outright, but the fratricide was prevented by the bystanders.

Immediately after the rain, Col. Willet made a sortie from the fort with a chosen band of soldiers. This sortie was intended to favour the entrance of Herkimer into the fort, and he, when apprized of its being made, was to rush forward; but being attacked beforehand, this well concerted plan was

frustrated, as to its primary object. But the celerity and impetuosity of Col. Willet's movements were such as to throw the enemies' camp into the greatest disorder. Most of the Indians too, and some of the best troops of the British, were at that moment engaged in the battle of Oriskany. Those that remained in the camp, being thus unexpectedly and vigorously attacked, fled to the woods for shelter, where they were pursued by Willet's men. The baggage and camp equipage of the enemy fell in large quantities into the hands of the garrison. Among other things taken were five British standards, and the baggage of Sir John Johnson. At this time St. Leger, who was on the opposite side of the river, made a movement to intercept Col. Willet in his return to the fort; but they got back without the loss of a single man.

General Herkimer did not long survive the battle of Oriskany, in which he was wounded so severely, and behaved so bravely. He was conducted to his own house on the Mohawk, where he died in the faith of the gospel. Congress passed a resolution requesting the governor and council of New York to erect a monument to his memory, which however was never accomplished. He was of German descent, and his family were among the first who settled in the Mohawk valley.

Fort Schuyler continued beleaguered for some time longer; and many interesting events occurred which we have no room to mention. A panic seized the besieging army, occasioned by the report of a strange being, called Hon Yost Schuyler, who reported that Arnold, with two thousand men, was rapidly advancing. The siege was suddenly raised, and both St. Leger and Sir John Johnson commenced their retreat with all possible expedition. Arnold was indeed advancing, and reached the fort soon after the enemy had decamped.

In the opening of the season, in 1778, Thayendanegea had returned to his former haunts on the Susquehanna, Oghkwa-ga, and Unadilla. He soon proved himself an active and a dreaded partisan. No matter for the difficulties or the distance, wherever a blow could be struck to any advantage, Joseph Brant was sure to be there. Secrecy, energy and celerity characterised his conduct in the border warfare then waged against the white settlements. Without the least previous warning whole neighbourhoods were cut off, the houses

burnt, and the inhabitants murdered, or carried off prisoners. In these scenes of savage cruelty, the Tories were often the instigators of the Indians, and commonly their companions.

During this year Brant made a descent upon Springfield, a small town at the head of Otsego lake. The chieftain burnt the entire settlement, with the exception of a single house, into which he conducted all the women and children, and left them uninjured.

In this same year (1778) occurred the melancholy and tragical invasion of Wyoming valley. A detailed, and we presume, an authentic history of this valley is given by our author, in the fifteenth chapter of his work. The whole is very interesting; but that part which relates to the massacre of the white inhabitants by the Indians has been consecrated by an elegant English poet,* who represents Brant as a monster of cruelty, and as the principal actor in this bloody scene. But our author undertakes his vindication; and if his proof of one part is satisfactory, nothing more is necessary to rescue the character of his favourite Indian from the foul stain cast upon it by the poet; and this fact is, that Brant was not present, at all, in that expedition. His son, when in Europe, entered into a correspondence with the poet, and successfully vindicated his father's memory from the calumny. Our historian corrects all our former accounts of the affair of Wyoming, even that of Marshall in his life of Washington, and asserts, "that after the capitulation, no massacre took place."

The most considerable transaction of this year, in which Brant was a leader, was the destruction of the populous settlement of the German Flatts. This is the most beautiful portion of the Mohawk valley. Here was the residence of the Herkimer family; and the fort, therefore, was called Fort Herkimer. At this time there were about thirty houses on each side of the river. The year had been fruitful, and the barns were abundantly filled. Some suspicion of Brant's design had been entertained, and a scout of four men was sent to gain intelligence. Three of them were killed; but the fourth made his escape and gave the alarm. The inhabitants gathered into the forts, Dayton and Herkimer. It was on the evening of one of the last days of August, that Brant arrived at the edge of the settlement: but as the night was dark and rainy, he halted with his forces in a ravine near the house of a Tory, named Shoemaker. Here he lay until the storm

* Campbell's "Gertrude of Wyoming."

broke away, towards morning—unconscious that his approach had been notified to the people, by the scout, in season to enable them to escape the blow of his uplifted arm. Before the dawn he was on foot, and his warriors were sweeping through the settlement; so that the torch might be almost simultaneously applied to every building it contained. Just as the day was breaking in the east, the fires were kindled, and the whole section of the valley was speedily illuminated by the flames of houses and barns, and all things else combustible. The spectacle to the people in the forts was one of melancholy grandeur. Every family saw the flames and smoke of its own domicile ascending to the skies, and every farmer the whole product of his labour for the season dissolving into ashes. The Indians, however, having no larger guns than rifles, made no attempt on the forts, but busied themselves in driving off the cattle of the inhabitants. Although this descent of the Indians on the beautiful settlement of the German Flatts was disastrous, as it related to the property of the inhabitants, yet no more than two persons were killed.

A much more disastrous and fatal attack was made on Fort Schuyler this year, then under the command of Col. Ichabod Alden; a man little acquainted with Indian warfare. All reports of the approach of the Indians and loyalists were discredited by him, and he refused to permit the inhabitants of the surrounding country to come into the fort, with their most valuable articles, for safety. On the 10th of November, Butler with his rangers, and Brant with his Indians, encamped within a mile of the fort and village of Cherry Valley. The officers of the garrison were in the habit of lodging in the houses of the respectable inhabitants in the vicinity. Col. Alden, and his lieutenant Col. Stacia, lodged with Robert Wells, Esq., a gentleman of great respectability, and recently a judge of the county. The Indians would have taken them by surprize had not a man been shot at and wounded, who, however, escaped to the fort and gave the alarm. But still Col. Alden could not be persuaded that there was any thing more than a straggling Indian or so; but he was soon convinced of his error; for before the guards could be called in, the Indians were upon them. The Senecas, the most ferocious of the Six Nations, were in the van; the Rangers had stopped a little to dry their arms wet with the rain. The house of Mr. Wells was instantly surrounded by the warriors of the tribe, and several

tories of no less ferocity. The family, at that time, consisted of himself, his mother, his wife, his brother and sister, John and Jane, three of his sons, Samuel, Robert, and William, and his daughter Eleanor. All these were murdered. The only survivor of this large family was John, then at school, at Schenectady. Col. Alden himself was pursued some distance by an Indian, and, refusing to surrender, his pursuer threw his tomahawk at his head with unerring aim, and then came up and scalped him. Lieut. Col. Stacia was made prisoner. One of the tories boasted that he had killed Mr. Wells while at prayer. "His sister Jane was distinguished alike for her beauty, her accomplishments, and her virtues. As the savages entered the house she fled to a wood-pile on the premises, and endeavoured to conceal herself. She was pursued by an Indian, who with perfect composure wiped and sheathed his dripping knife, and took his tomahawk from his girdle. At this instant, a tory, who had formerly been a domestic in the family; sprang forward, and interposed in her behalf—claiming her as a sister. The maiden too, who understood somewhat of the Indian language, implored for mercy. But in vain. With one hand the Indian pushed the tory from him, and with the other planted the hatchet deep into her temple.

Among the other families massacred, was that of the Rev. Mr. Dunlop. Mrs. Dunlop was killed outright; and thus shared the fate of Mrs. Wells, who was her daughter. Mr. Dunlop and another daughter would have been murdered, but for the interposition of Little Aaron, a chief of the Oghkwaga branch of the Mohawks, who led the old gentleman, tottering beneath the weight of years, to the door, and stood behind him for his protection. But this venerable servant of God survived the shock but a little while: he died within a year afterward.

The case of a certain Mr. Mitchell was still more painful. He was in the field, at work, when he beheld the Indians approaching: and being already cut off from his house, his only course was to betake himself to the woods. On returning, after the enemy had retired, he found his house on fire, and within its walls were his wife and three of his children. The fourth, a little girl of ten or twelve, had been left for dead; but signs of life appearing, the parent having extinguished the fire, brought her to the door, and while bending over her, discovered a straggling party of the enemy approaching. He had but just time to conceal himself, when

a tory named Newberry rushed forward and extinguished, by a blow of his hatchet, what little hope of life had been left. The whole of the inhabitants killed were thirty-two, mostly women and children; and sixteen soldiers beside. A greater number were made prisoners. Some few escaped, among whom was Mrs. Clyde, wife of Col. Clyde, who was absent at the time. She succeeded in reaching the woods with three of her children, where she lay concealed until the next day. The eldest daughter likewise had made a successful flight, and returned in safety. Colonel Campbell was also absent; but hastening home on hearing the alarm, he arrived only in time to see the destruction of his property, and to ascertain that his wife and family were carried into captivity. Every building in the village was burnt to the ground. The prisoners, who amounted to thirty or forty, were marched, on the evening of the massacre, about two miles, to the place where the Indians encamped. Fires were kindled all around them, and they were crowded into a narrow circle in the midst, exposed to the hearing of the horrid yells of exultation from the savages. A division of the spoil was made in the night; and in the morning their march was resumed. They had not proceeded far before a halt was made, and it was announced that all the women and children would be released, excepting Mrs. Campbell, and Mrs. Moore, and a few others. These it was resolved to retain in captivity, as a punishment to their husbands, for the active part they had taken in the war. The rest were sent back to the fort with a letter from Capt. Walter N. Butler, the commander of the Rangers.

They then, disencumbered, proceeded on their march, but Mrs. Cannon, the mother of Mrs. Campbell, being infirm and incapable of marching rapidly, was put to death by the side of her daughter, on the second day of their march. Mrs. Campbell, having a child only eighteen months old in her arms, was driven along before the uplifted hatchet with barbarous rapidity, until she fell into the hands of a more humane master. "Thus terminated the expedition of Walter N. Butler and Joseph Brant to Cherry Valley. Nothing could exhibit an aspect of more entire desolation, than the village, on the following day, when the militia from the Mohawk valley arrived too late to afford assistance."

"Next to the destruction of Wyoming, that of Cherry Valley stands out in history as having been the most conspicuous for its atrocity. And as the case of Wyoming, both in

history and popular tradition, Joseph Brant has been held up as the foul fiend of the barbarians, and of all others deserving the deepest execration." But Capt. Brant, as he was not present in the Wyoming expedition, so he was not the leader in this; and he asserted, and there is no reason to question his veracity, that on the morning of the attack, he left the main body of the Indians, and endeavoured to anticipate their arrival at the house of Mr. Wells, for the purpose of affording protection to the family; but having to cross a ploughed field, he was unable to accomplish his purpose.

The author thus endeavours to shield from the odium of the cruel murders of Cherry Valley the character of his hero. How successfully, we leave the reader to judge; but hope that before he makes up his opinion, he will read the whole story, as given by Colonel Stone.

The next remarkable military expedition, in which Capt. Brant acted a conspicuous part, was the invasion of Minisink. This town, though very remote, and much out of the way, is one of the oldest in this part of America. Its whole history too is romantic and interesting. A severe battle was fought with the Indians here as early as July 22, 1669, the bloody horrors of which yet live in the traditions of that neighbourhood. It was about the 20th of July, 1779, that Brant made his descent on this ancient village. His object probably was to take both prisoners and plunder. The place had unhappily been left without any protection, and the inhabitants were taken entirely by surprize. Ten houses and twelve barns were burnt. Several houses were in flames before the sleeping inhabitants awoke. Several persons were killed, and some prisoners taken. The farms were laid waste, and the cattle driven away. Brant had accomplished this destruction with a select band of his warriors, having left the main body of his Indians at Grassy Brook. Having completed his design, he immediately returned. When the fugitives from Minisink arrived at Goshen, about ten miles east, the alarm was quickly spread, and a company of a hundred and forty-nine men rendezvoused and rallied round Col. Tusten. The question whether they should attempt a pursuit was agitated. Col. Tusten was opposed to it, until they could receive a reinforcement; but others were for immediate pursuit, and spoke contemptuously of the Indian force. Of this class was Maj. Meeker, who, flourishing his sword over his head, cried out, "Let the brave men follow me, and the cowards may stay behind." This decided the matter. All marched

forward. On the second day, having been joined by a small reinforcement under Col. Hathorn of the Warwick regiment, they proceeded until they arrived at the camp occupied by the Indians the previous night. Here again the question of immediate pursuit was agitated. Col. Tusten was strongly in favour of delay, but again the more ardent spirits prevailed. Capt. Tyler, having been sent forward to ascertain the condition and distance of the enemy, was shot down by an unseen enemy. Very soon the whole body of the Indians were seen marching in a direct line towards a ford of the Delaware. Col. Hathorn determined to intercept them, but in doing this he necessarily lost sight of them. Brant, no doubt, suspecting his design, wheeled about, and crossing a ravine, came upon the rear of Hathorn's force; and contrived to cut off entirely from the main body about one third of his men. The battle, however, was long and bloody. The number of Indians being much greater than the Goshen militia, they were able nearly to hem them in on all sides. The battle continued from eleven o'clock, A. M., until sun down. The fighting was in the Indian fashion, from behind trees, rocks, and bushes. About sun down, the ammunition of the militia gave out, and they attempted to retreat, but many of them were killed. Col. Tusten, who, being a physician, acted as surgeon to his corps, had a number of wounded under his care behind a cliff; but the Indians came upon them and killed the wounded, and tomahawked Tusten himself. Among the slain were many of the first citizens of Goshen; and of the whole number that went out, only thirty returned to tell the melancholy story.

Brant has been censured for the cruelties perpetrated, or alleged to have been perpetrated, in this battle. He always maintained that he had been unjustly blamed, and that his conduct had been the subject of unjust reproach. He asserted, that he informed the commander of the militia that he had men enough in ambush to overwhelm his force; and advised him, at once, to surrender; but that while they were parleying, the Americans began to fire, on which he gave the signal to his warriors, and they darted forth, tomahawk in hand. The militia also, in crossing a creek, had broken their ranks, and had not time to form again, until the Indians, with their dreadful war whoop, were upon them. Col. Gabriel Wisner, one of the Goshen volunteers, was mortally wounded, and taken prisoner. Brant seeing that he could not live, and must be left behind, to save him from the agonies of a lingering

death, engaged him in conversation, and then suddenly with his tomahawk struck him dead on the spot. Here was indeed the humanity of a savage.

We have, in the first chapter of Vol. II., an account of the capture of lieutenant Boyd, by Brant and his Indians, after nearly all his men had been killed. The employment of the sign by which the fraternity of free-masons recognize each other, had the effect of inducing Brant, who was a free-mason, to spare the life of Boyd; but it was only to rescue him for tortures of the most ingenious cruelty of which we have any authentic account: not, it is true, by the consent of Brant, who had been called away, but by the tory Butler, who, when Boyd refused to make any communications respecting the condition of Sullivan's army, to which he belonged, gave him up to the tender mercies of the savages. The manner in which he was tortured, we shall give entire. "Having been denuded, Boyd was tied to a sapling, where the Indians first practised upon the steadiness of his nerves, by hurling their tomahawks apparently at his head, but so as to strike the trunk of the sapling as near to his head as possible without hitting it—groups of Indians, in the mean time, brandishing their knives and tomahawks, and dancing round him with the most frantic demonstrations of joy. His nails were pulled out, his nose cut off, and one of his eyes plucked out. His tongue was also cut out, and he was stabbed in various places. After amusing themselves sufficiently, in this way, a small incision was made in his abdomen, and the end of one of his intestines taken out and fastened to the tree. The victim was then unbound, and driven around the tree, until all his intestines had been literally drawn from his body, and wound round its trunk. His sufferings were then terminated by striking his head from his body."

One of the most considerable and hotly contested battles which occurred in this war, took place the 29th of August, this year (1779). The American forces, under Sullivan, were under the particular commands of Clinton, Hand, Poor, and Maxwell. The Indians were, as usual, commanded by Brant, whose force was estimated by Sullivan, at fifteen hundred, but by their own account, less than half that number. The regular troops and savages were led by Col. John Butler, Sir John and Guy Johnson, Major Walter Butler, and Capt. M'Donald. The dispositions and orders of Sullivan were very judicious, and were carried into effect with precision. Both Indians and tories fought bravely, and stood a hot cannon-

ade in their front, for more than two hours. But Poor with his brigade having gained their flank, their ranks were broken; and although Brant, who was every where in the hottest of the battle, endeavoured to rally his men, yet his efforts were ineffectual. The Indians were terrified and confounded with the thundering of the cannon, and having raised the *retreat-halloo*, they fled with precipitation, leaving their packs and in many cases their arms. Eleven of their dead were found on the field; but most of them, according to their custom, were carried off. The Americans had adopted the savage custom of scalping their enemies: and on this occasion took eight scalps. The loss of the Americans was surprisingly small; only five or six men were killed, and between forty and fifty wounded. This battle was fought near to Newtown, now called Elmira.

An incident which proved Brant's regard for the customs of Christian and civilized life, occurred at the fort of Niagara. A Miss More, who had been detained in captivity with Mrs. Campbell, was to be married to one of the officers of the garrison. Thayendanegea, being present at the wedding, although he had been some time united to his wife by the ties of an Indian marriage, now embraced the opportunity of having the English marriage ceremony performed.

The chief was never long inactive. The month of April, 1780, found him on the war-path, at the head of a small party of Indians and Tories, whom he led against the settlement of Harper's Field, which was taken by surprise and destroyed. Most of the inhabitants, however, had left the settlement, so that there were but few persons killed, and only nineteen prisoners taken. It was the intention of Brant, on this incursion, to have destroyed the fort of Schoharie also; but falling in with a company from the fort, engaged in sugar-making, he surrounded and took them, after having killed three of the number. Capt. Alexander Harper was at the head of this little company, and among the prisoners, from whom Brant received such an account (though not true) of the force of Schoharie, that the chief did not consider himself sufficiently strong to attack the fort. The Indians, suspecting the truth of his narrative, had him examined again, when Brant scrutinized his countenance, to discover whether any signs of falsehood could be detected, but Harper so governed every muscle, and so exactly repeated what he said at first, that the desired effect was produced; and no attempt was made on Schoharie, which was in a most defenceless state.

But a new trial awaited the prisoners. On the march, Brant detached eleven of his men to make another descent on Minisink, who took prisoners five athletic men. When night came on, the prisoners being bound, the Indians lay down to sleep; one of the prisoners found means to release himself from his bonds, and then silently unloosed his companions. They now took from the sleeping Indians as many tomahawks as they wanted, and immediately fell upon them and killed nine, and wounded the tenth; the remaining Indian made his escape. When Brant came up, the death-yell of this solitary man startled him; and, upon drawing near, he found the bodies of the slain Indians. The most violent rage now seized the Indians. They determined at once to take vengeance on the prisoners. But while they were unsheathing their knives, the Indian who had escaped the massacre of his brethren, ran into the camp, and, being a chief, his address was listened to by his companions. The plea which he urged why the prisoners should not be slain, was, that they were innocent of the massacre, and ought not to suffer for the guilty. By the earnestness of his address, and the force of his argument, he obtained a suspension of the stroke. This Indian chief, it seems, had resided in Schoharie, and knew, personally, all the prisoners. This, no doubt, had its effect on his conduct; but it was a noble action, and would have conferred immortality on the chief, in the palmy days of Greece and Rome. The prisoners, however, were obliged to run the gauntlet, which is a painful and degrading punishment. The Indians arrange themselves in two lines, and the prisoner is forced to run between them, from one end to the other, every one giving him a kick or a stroke as he passes.

After the war was terminated, Brant negotiated with Sir Frederick Haldimand for a tract of country lying on Grand river, and thither the Mohawks removed. This land he and his tribe considered as made over to them as fully as the country was possessed in the Mohawk valley: but after some time a difficulty arose on the subject of the title, which was a source of great trouble and anxiety to Brant.

The majority of the Six Nations, and especially the Mohawks and Senecas, having taken part with the British, and having fought against the States to the close of the war, might have been treated as enemies by the American government; for their friends, the British, had made no stipulations in their behalf, in the treaty by which the war was concluded,

and the independence of the United States acknowledged. But instead of dealing rigourously with these sons of the forest, Washington and the congress appeared anxious to conciliate their friendship, and to treat with them not merely on principles of justice, but of generosity. Accordingly, on the 22d of October, 1784, a treaty was signed, by which the United States gave peace to the Mohawks, Senecas, Onondagas, and Cayugas; and received them under their protection, on condition that all prisoners should be delivered up. The Oneidas and Tuscaroras, who had been the friends of the Americans, were secured in possession of the lands then in their occupation. To secure the return of the prisoners, hostages of some Indian chiefs were required. Brant and many others were much dissatisfied with this treaty; and especially, with the detention of any of the chiefs as hostages. On which occasion he addressed an expostulatory letter to Col. James Monroe.

In 1785, Brant again sailed for England. His object, it was alleged, was to obtain remuneration for his Mohawks, for their sufferings and services, during the war. The reception of the distinguished chief in the British capital was all that the proudest forest king could have desired. Here he met with many with whom he had been well acquainted in America, who received him most cordially. Among these were the Earl of Dorchester, formerly Sir Guy Carlton, Earl Moira, who had served in America as Lord Rawdon, Sir Charles Stuart, fourth son of the Earl of Bute, who had often slept under the same tent with him. With the Duke of Northumberland, then Lord Percy, he had likewise formed an acquaintance in America, which ripened into a lasting attachment, and was maintained by a correspondence only interrupted by death. He had also become acquainted with several noble and distinguished persons on his former visit to England. And at this time many sought his acquaintance; such as Charles Fox, James Boswell, and the bishop of London. Fox presented him with a silver snuff-box bearing the initials of his name. He was also a great favourite with the king and queen; and equally well did he stand with the Prince of Wales.

While in London, he addressed two letters to Lord Sidney, respecting the claims of his tribe; and one, written in a magnanimous spirit, to Sir Evan Nepean, respecting a proposal of some persons, that he should receive, during life, half-pay, as a British captain, which he declined. His dress and public

appearance attracted much attention; his costume was half military and half savage. His countenance was manly and intelligent, his manners easy and dignified, and his conversation fluent and sensible, and, when he pleased, uncommonly witty.

His great object, after his return to America, was to unite all the Indians by a solemn league, and, by a definite line of demarcation, to set some bounds to the encroachment of the whites on the Indian territory. But Gen. St. Clair defeated his purpose by entering into separate treaties with several of the tribes. And from the published correspondence, it is certain, that congress dreaded such a confederacy; and that their agents laboured to prevent its formation.

The treaties formed with the Indians by St. Clair did not, however, bring about a pacification. Indeed, it was not long before hostilities commenced; and the repeated defeats of the Americans, under Harding and Harmar, and, finally, the disastrous overthrow of St. Clair's army raised the confidence of the Indians very high, and furnished a subject of deep mortification, as well as great expense of blood and treasure, to the United States. Whether Brant was in any of these battles is uncertain. Our author seems to think that he was an active leader at St. Clair's defeat; but his name has never been mentioned in any of the accounts which we have seen of this battle. If he had been present, doubtless, he would have been conspicuous above all the chiefs who were engaged in that affair. The Americans never suffered more in any battle with the Indians than this. "Thirty-eight commissioned officers were killed on the field, and four hundred and ninety-three non-commissioned officers and privates killed and missing;" while the loss of the Indians was about one hundred and fifty killed, and a considerable number wounded. This defeat was chiefly owing to the cowardice and insubordination of the militia; but there was a great want of wise generalship in the commander in chief; although during the battle he behaved as well as could have been expected from a man confined to his litter with the gout. As to the presence of Brant, Col. Stone merely says, without alleging any authorities, "Gen. St. Clair probably died in ignorance of the fact that one of the master-spirits against whom he contended was none other than Joseph Brant Thayendanegea."

Great pains were now taken to gain the friendship of Brant, by the American government. The Rev. Mr. Kirkland, before mentioned, was engaged to write to the Mohawk

chief; and General Knox, the Secretary of War, addressed a letter to him in his own name, earnestly inviting him to visit Philadelphia, and assuring him that he would be well received by the president, General Washington.

In June, 1792, Brant arrived at Philadelphia, where he was kindly and courteously received by the president, heads of departments, and all other persons of distinction about the government. He appeared to enter very sincerely into the views of the American government, as it related to a general peace with the Indians, and promised his influence and mediation to effect the object, as far as they would go. But other means of accomplishing the same object were not neglected. Messengers of peace were sent to visit the several nations: and Timothy Pickering, Beverly Randolph, and Benjamin Lincoln, were commissioned to go out to the Indian country, and treat with as many of the Indians as could be collected in a general council. After long delays, the council met in August, 1793, at the Miami Rapids, and their address, in which they laid down their terms of peace, was signed by the Wyandots, seven nations of Canada, Delawares, Shawanese, Miamis, Ottawas, Chippeways, Senecas, Pottawattamies, and several other less considerable tribes. The Six Nations and Brant did not sign it, as they were professedly desirous of peace; and the address of the council gave no reason to hope for any thing but war. The commissioners before mentioned were very desirous to be present at the deliberations of the council, but this privilege was not granted them. The ultimatum of the Indians, or rather their preliminary condition, was, that the Ohio river should be the boundary between the whites and Indians. This put an end to all expectations of a peace; and active preparations were made on both sides to prosecute the war.

General Wayne had already been appointed to succeed St. Clair, and a large force was enlisted, and officers of known courage and skill were commissioned.

On the 12th of August, 1794, General Wayne brought the Indians to action, and by a judicious disposition of his forces, and the courage and activity of his men, under the favour of Providence, gained a complete victory over the savage foe. The loss of the Americans was about one hundred and seven killed and wounded, including officers: the loss of the Indians is not known, but must have been considerable.

Whatever may have been Brant's real sentiments, after visiting Philadelphia, there is too much evidence that he now

advised the Indians not to make peace, except on the conditions before offered, of making the river Ohio the line. He was probably led to take this course, because there was a prospect of a war between Great Britain and the United States. But from this time the Mohawk chief was no more connected with military operations; we shall therefore conclude our narrative, by exhibiting him more fully in a civil capacity.

We have already mentioned his concern about the lands granted to the Mohawks on Grand river; and the difficulty which arose about the title. To obtain the interference of the British government in favour of the rights of his tribe, he sent his adopted nephew, John Norton, to England, with letters to Lord Dorchester and others: but through the communication of a council at which Red Jacket was the presiding spirit, all Norton's efforts proved ineffectual.

The duke of Northumberland, the unceasing friend of Thayendanegea, in a letter to him, strongly dissuaded him from exchanging the Indian habits, and the hunting life, for the pursuits of agriculture; alleging, that one free, independent Indian, was of more value than ten plodding labourers in the earth. Joseph Brant, however, entertained very different sentiments on this subject, and had nothing more at heart than to see his people civilized, and to induce them to change their roving, restless habits, which prevented all improvment and domestic comfort, for those of the white people; which in his own person and family he had long adopted. But his views were still higher. When young he appeared to be under deep religious impressions, and entered the communion of the Episcopal church; but whether these serious impressions were entirely effaced by the active and arduous duties of a military life we undertake not to say. One thing is certain, that Brant retained through life a firm belief in the divine origin of the Christian religion; and wished to see his people brought under its influence. It has been seen how zealously he assisted in preparing books for the Indians, assisting the missionaries in making a version of the Prayer Book into the Iroquois language: and he himself devoted much time to a translation of the gospel of Mark into the language of his tribe. When he entered into stipulations for the country on Grand river, he insisted on three things, a church, a school-house, and a flour-mill. And when the war was terminated, he again turned his attention to the means of having religion established among the Mohawks. He therefore used

great exertion to obtain a missionary; and having found a gentleman, as he thought, well qualified for a religious instructor, he applied repeatedly and earnestly to the bishop of Quebec to ordain him, and failing here, he applied to the bishop of New York, who acceded to his wishes. He also entered into correspondence with some distinguished members of the Missionary Society of New York, particularly the Rev. Doctors Mason and Miller; and when this Society sent to the Indians, Mr. Holmes, a pious missionary, he received him kindly. Indeed, his house was always the missionaries' home when in his neighbourhood; where they were hospitably treated when well, and tenderly nursed when sick.

Brant left several children; two of whom were educated at Dartmouth College. He died after a painful illness, Nov. 24, 1807, at his residence near the head of lake Ontario, in the full possession of his faculties, and according to the belief of his attendants, in the full faith of the Christian religion.

ART. II.—*Bible Class Manual: or a System of Theology, in the order of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, adapted to Bible Classes.* By John M'Dowell, D.D., Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Vol. I. 12mo. pp. 382. Philadelphia: William S. Martien. 1838.

It ought to be the great object of every minister of the gospel, and indeed of every one who wishes to promote the spiritual benefit of his fellow men, first of all, and above all, to bring their minds into contact with the word of God. He who does this most simply, diligently, affectionately and perseveringly, takes a course best adapted to promote the temporal and eternal welfare of those whom he addresses. Whether he approaches the young or the old, the rich or the poor, the learned or the illiterate—it is all the same—the Bible—the Bible ought to be his main instrument—and under God, his chief dependence for “preparing the way of the Lord” in the hearts and lives of all whom he wishes to lead in the way of holiness and salvation.

It is gratifying to observe how much more amply and

happily the times in which we live are furnished with helps for the attainment of this object, than were the times of our fathers. We are apt to think the former days better than the present. But in whatever other respects this may be said, it cannot be justly said in reference to aids for the instruction of the rising generation. It would be happy for us all if they were employed with as much diligence and skill as they have been produced.

The appearance of every manual which tends to render the Bible more familiar to the minds of the young, and better understood by them, may be regarded as a public benefit. We have long been persuaded that, unless the minds of children and young people are early imbued with religious knowledge; unless they are made intimately acquainted, in the morning of life, with well composed elementary works in this branch of knowledge, they will be apt to manifest the disadvantage arising from this defect in their youthful training, as long as they live. Even if they afterwards become pious, and ever so diligent in theological study, still the loss of accurate youthful instruction seems, in many cases, never to be really compensated. It is storied of a young candidate for the ministry, recently on trials before an ecclesiastical body, that, being at some loss for an answer when asked—"What is Justification?" a spectator remarked to one seated beside him—"Poor young man! what a pity his mother did not teach him the Catechism!"—Upon the same principle, no doubt, it was that the late Principal Robertson, of the University of Edinburgh, when consulted, as he of course often was, by candidates for the ministry in the Scottish Church, he was in the constant habit of recommending to them, as the first book to be carefully studied, after the Bible, Vincent's explanation of the *Catechism*. And when they expressed surprise, as they sometimes did, that a work so simple and elementary, and so much better adapted to school-boys and children than to theological students, should be recommended to those who were taking their places in a more elevated form; he never failed to inculcate the vitally important lesson, that even a theological student is not prepared to proceed with advantage in his professional studies, until he has read, digested, thoroughly mastered, and fully deposited in his memory, the first principles of gospel truth, as exhibited in well prepared formularies. He was wont to insist, that, without an intimate acquaintance with such formularies, even a man of real talents and learning, will be apt

to be less simple, clear and elementary in his views of truth, and far less ready in exhibiting and applying them to the capacities of the young and the ignorant, as well as of the better instructed, than if he were early made at home in such compositions.

The counsel of this celebrated man does him great honour. None but a vain and superficial thinker ever thought little of well constructed ecclesiastical formularies, and of judicious commentaries, adapted to make them popular and useful. This the venerable Calvin well understood and appreciated, when, immediately after his return to Geneva, after the banishment, disgraceful to the hostile faction only, which had sent him away,—he began to employ himself diligently in Catechisms and other compends intended to instruct all, and especially the rising generation, in the principles of true religion.

We are deeply persuaded that the early and diligent study of the Bible is of more importance in the formation of the intellectual and moral character, than is commonly supposed even by reflecting and serious people. Many imagine that a deficiency in the private study of the scriptures may be supplied by the instruction of the pulpit. But such persons forget that preaching itself is likely to be in a great measure useless without a previous acquaintance with the word of God. Without this, the very language of the sacred writers will appear strange and unintelligible; and the allusions of preachers to the sentiments, the characters, and the examples of the Bible will be in a great measure lost. Pastors and parents, then, can never prepare the youth committed to their care for a profitable attendance on the sanctuary, without unwearied labour to imbue their minds with elementary knowledge, and especially to make them familiar with the contents of the sacred volume. The more we see and hear of the scenes passing before us, the more we are persuaded that, with all our Sabbath schools, and other boasted privileges of the day, a radical deficiency in the religious instruction and training of the youth of the church is one of the great crying sins of our age. We never had so many popular religious books; and, at the same time, so little solid religious reading. Never so many facilities for imbuing the minds of children with elementary knowledge; and, at the same time, so little of that discriminating indoctrination in first principles which is adapted to prepare the rising generation to be intelligent Christians, and “witnesses for the truth,” when

the solemn trust of ecclesiastical responsibility shall be devolved upon them.

The Catechisms of our church have a degree of excellence at once peculiar and pre-eminent. We know of none that can claim the most distant title to a preference. Their richness and density of thought; their clearness and felicity of diction; and their remarkable accuracy and comprehensiveness of instruction, are absolutely without a parallel in the whole catalogue of ecclesiastical formularies. They have been the theme of the admiration and praise of all competent and impartial judges for nearly two hundred years. And yet, though our fathers used and lauded them: and though their beneficial influence has been so strikingly manifested; their use, for the last thirty years, has been in a great measure banished from our churches. They have been either superseded by others of far less value; or they have been suffered to drop out of use, as too sectarian, without the adoption of others, of even tolerable character, to supply their place. Of late, indeed, there has appeared to be some little waking up to the proper estimate and use of these admirable compends of Gospel truth; but we have, as yet, seen nothing to revive the hope, that the good old habits of our Scottish and Puritan fathers, with regard to these formularies, were about to return: habits of thoroughly committing to memory the larger as well as the shorter catechism, and making the recitation of them not merely a quarterly or half yearly task; but the business of every week, and sometimes of every day.

With these views, we greatly rejoice that the highly respected author of the manual before us, has thought proper to employ himself in a work so important, and so well adapted to reward labour as the preparation of the volume under review. Dr. M'Dowell, about ten or eleven years ago, published a system of theology, in the form of sermons, in two volumes, octavo, which were considered as a monument of the author's solid merit, both as a divine and a sermonizer. The substance of the first of these volumes he has here presented in an abridged and improved form; and exhibiting what we hope will prove an acceptable and useful offering, not only to the youth of his own large and important flock, but also to the young people of many other congregations. The work is executed with judgment and with care, and we hope it will soon be completed by the addition of the second volume, which we take for granted the author intends to give.

The author, in a short preface, speaks thus of his work—
“It has been revised, and is now offered to the public in the form of a continued treatise, divided into chapters, instead of sermons. In preparing it in this form, the introductions to the several sermons, and the practical observations at the close of them, have generally been omitted. The special object of the author in this edition has been to prepare the work for the use of his own bible class, that the Scriptures may be studied in connexion with our own excellent catechism, and the great doctrines of religion in systematic order. To facilitate this object, he has made out a course of questions on each chapter. The questions on each chapter are preceded by a portion of Scripture as the subject of the bible lesson, in which portion the doctrine of the chapter is the prominent subject. The plan of the author, in his bible class, is to ask general questions, suggested by the portion of Scripture, which is given as the lesson; and then to take up the doctrine of the chapter in the system, and dwell particularly on this. If any pastor should see proper to introduce this work into his bible class, he can, according to his judgment, give any other portion of Scripture, as the foundation of the lesson on any particular doctrine.”

In reading this volume we have been struck with the fact, that the doctrines which it teaches are, strictly, those of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of our Church. The author has not only adopted, as his title page intimates, “the *order* of the Westminster Shorter Catechism;” but he has followed its *spirit* throughout. We hope this will be borne in mind by our readers. There are those, at the present day, claiming to be, pre-eminently, “revival preachers,” who contend, that the “old fashioned doctrines of Calvinism” are unfriendly to revivals of religion, and tend to lull their hearers asleep in supineness and sloth. We have before us a specimen of the habitual preaching of Dr. M'Dowell. We see here how he instructs the old and the young who are committed to his pastoral charge. Perhaps the preaching of no modern pastor is in more strict accordance with what some are fond of calling the “old dead orthodoxy” of the Reformers and our Puritan fathers. And yet the ministry of few pastors in the United States has been more frequently and signally blessed by powerful revivals of religion than his. By the instrumentality of those great truths so often and so profanely derided, have sinners in great numbers been convinced and converted, and believers edified and comforted

under his ministry. These were the doctrines too, unceasingly preached by Whitefield, by the Tennents, and by other men in their day, who were as eminently favoured with revivals of religion as any men who ever trod the American soil. It is altogether too late, then, to tell us, that the preaching of these doctrines tends to lull men asleep in sin, and to destroy the hopes of the lover of revivals. Not only the word of God, but the whole history of the church, contradicts this allegation, and shows it to be a vain dream. Nay, the very reverse of this allegation is the fact. It is notorious, from the annals of the church, in every period of her progress, that the prevalence of Pelagian and Semipelagian opinions, instead of promoting, as their advocates promised, vital piety, and evangelical zeal, has never failed to be ultimately destructive of both; and to beget either fanatical excitement, or lifeless formality, according to the circumstances of each particular case.

Never have the reformed churches been in a better condition since the time of the reformers, than when the doctrines of strict Calvinism universally reigned; when a profession of faithful adherence to Calvinistic formularies was exacted of every pastor and elder; and when the youth of the church were trained with uniformity and fidelity in the same system. Then, in all cases, has the church exhibited the largest share of vital piety; the most enlightened and steady zeal in doing good; the richest fruits of holy living; and the most happy success in training up a seed to serve God, who were "accounted to the Lord as a generation."

Were it possible, therefore, so to lift up our voice as to cause it to be heard by every pastor, by every ruling elder, and by every professing Christian in our beloved church, we would exert it in saying to them, let the children of the church be the objects of your vigilant and unceasing care. Let them be familiar, from their mother's lap, with the Bible, with the Catechisms of the church, and with such judicious compends of Christian doctrine as shall pre-occupy their minds with divine truth, to the exclusion of the countless errors which are ever found to assail their opening faculties. Let the officers of the church, as their moral parent, regard them as, in some respects, the most precious part of their charge; providing for their instruction; suppressing every kind of vice and immorality in them; reminding them of their baptismal dedication; putting in the Master's claim to their affections and services; and

accompanying every effort with unceasing prayer with them, and for them, that the Holy Spirit may accompany and crown with success all the means employed for their benefit.

Such must be among the means unceasingly employed, if we wish our church to be built up in knowledge, in purity and in peace; if we wish harmony and orthodoxy to reign in all our borders; if we desire our children to take the place of their fathers when we are sleeping in the dust, and to bear forward the ark of God to victory and glory in the future contests with error and sin, when we shall have resigned to them our armour. He who expects the church to gain such blessings without the use of such means, may just as well hope to "gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles." Without the faithful use of such means, if the church were to-day perfectly pure and united, we might expect to find her, in a few years, torn by divisions, forsaken of her children, and her best interests given to the winds.

ART. III.—1. *Elements of Psychology, included in a Critical Examination of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, with Additional Pieces.* By Victor Cousin, Peer of France, Member of the Royal Council of Public Instruction, Member of the Institute, and Professor of the History of Ancient Philosophy in the Faculty of Literature. Translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. C. S. Henry, D.D. Second Edition, prepared for the use of Colleges. New York: Gould and Newman. 1838. pp. 423. 12mo.

2. *Introduction to the History of Philosophy.* By Victor Cousin, Professor of Philosophy of the Faculty of Literature at Paris. Translated from the French, by Henning Gottfried Linberg. Boston. 1832. pp. 458. 8vo.

3. *An Address delivered before the Senior Class in Divinity College, Cambridge, Sunday, 15th July, 1838.* By Ralph Waldo Emerson. Boston. pp. 31. 8vo.

IT is we think undeniable, that since the death of Doctor Thomas Brown of Edinburgh, metaphysical research has been at a stand in Great Britain. In the southern part of the island this had been the case for a much longer period, but the sharp and sceptical enterprise of the Scotch kept

philosophical debate in motion for a time, so that a sect was formed, and we speak as familiarly of the Scotch school as we do of the Pythagorean or the Eleatic. But that line seems to have reached its term, and the few who publish at this time are either the lowliest compilers from Stewart and Brown, or, as is more frequently the case, such as have gone off in a direction altogether different, in search of a profounder philosophy. Of the latter sort, there are some among ourselves, and we have it now in view to point out some of the causes which may account for the essays to introduce a modified transcendentalism.

In America, the earliest school of metaphysics was founded by the followers of Locke; and with the clew of this great inquirer in his hand, Jonathan Edwards ventured into a labyrinth from which no English theologian had ever come out safe. By the just influence of his eminently patient, and discriminating, and conclusive research, this greatest of modern Christian metaphysicians put his contemporaries and their descendants upon a sort of discourse which will perhaps characterise New England Calvinism as long as there is a fibre of it left. In speaking of Edwards, we distinctly avow our conviction that he stands immeasurably above many who have followed in his steps, and attempted his methods. If the species of reasoning which he introduced into American theology is susceptible of easy abuse, and if, in fact, it has been abused to disastrous ends, we rejoice to acquit this great and holy man of willingly giving origin to the evil. And in what we shall cursorily remark concerning New England theology, we explicitly premise that we do not intend our Congregational brethren indiscriminately, but a defined portion of them, well known for many years as daring speculators. The theology of this school has always been, in a high degree, metaphysical; but the metaphysics is of a Hyperborean sort, exceedingly cold and fruitless. In the conduct of a feeble or even an ordinary mind, the wire-drawing processes of New England theologizing become jejune and revolting. Taught to consider mere ratiocination as the grand, and almost sole function of the human mind, the school-boy, the youth, and the professor, pen in hand, go on, day after day, in spinning out a thread of attenuated reasoning, often ingenious, and sometimes legitimately deduced, but in a majority of instances a concatenation of unimportant propositions. It has too often been forgotten by the disciples of this school, that a man may search in useless mines, and

that it is not every thing which is worth being proved. Hence the barrenness and frigidity of the sermons which were heard from the pulpits of New England during the latter half of the last century. Many of these and many of the dissertations and treatises which poured from the press were proofs of remarkable subtilty, and patience of investigation, and showed how easy it is to draw forth an endless line from the stores of a single mind. For, in this operation, it was remarkable, that the preacher or philosopher relied almost exclusively on his own stores. There was little continued unfolding of scriptural argument, and little citation of the great reasonings of ancient or modern philosophy. Each metaphysician spun by himself and from his own bowels. The web of philosophical argument was dashed with no strong woof from natural science, embroidered with no flowers of literature. Where this metaphysics was plied by a strong hand, as was that of President Edwards, it was noble indeed; deriving strength and honour from its very independence and self-sufficiency. In the hands of his son Dr. Edwards, there was equal patience, equal exactness, equal subtilty, but no new results: still there were undeniable marks of genius; as there were also in the controversy which then began to be waged among the dwindled progeny of the giants, on the great questions of liberty and necessity, moral agency, and the nature of virtue.

But when the same products were sought in a colder climate, and from the hands of common and unrefined men; when every schoolmaster or parish clergyman found himself under a necessity of arguing upon the nature of the soul, the nature of virtue, and the nature of agency; when with some this became the great matter of education, to the neglect of all science and beautiful letters, then the consequences were disastrous; and a winter reigned in the theology of the land, second only to that of the scholastic age, and like that dispersed only by the return of the sun of vital religion.

In the hands of a subtile errorist, such as Emmons, these metaphysical researches led to gross absurdities, some of which still survive. We believe a few of the elder and less sophisticated preachers of New England are to this day teaching, and that their staring auditors are to this day trying to believe, that the soul is a series of exercises; that God is the author of sin; and that, in order to escape damnation, one must be willing to be damned. Others, running away with an error less innocent because lying nearer the source of

moral reasoning, and less alarming in its guise, reasoned themselves and their hearers into the opinion, that all sin is selfishness, and that all holiness is the love of being in general. Taking the premises of the great Edwards, they deduced a system of false theology, which under its first phase as Hopkinsianism, and under its second phase as Taylorism, has been to our church the *fons et origo malorum*, and which, in union with the Epicureanism of the Paley school, has assumed the name of Calvinism to betray it to its enemies.

It is only great wisdom which can avoid one extreme without rushing to the other. The golden mean, so much ridiculed by zealots, is precisely that which imbecility could never maintain. In philosophy, as well as in common life and religion, we find individuals and bodies of men acting on the fallacy that the reverse of wrong, as such, is right. Human nature could not be expected to endure such a metaphysics as that of New England. It was not merely that it was false, and that it set itself up against our consciousness and our constitutional principle of self-love; but it was cheerless, it was arctic, it was intolerable: a man might as well carry frozen mercury in his bosom, as this in his soul. In a word, it had nothing cordial in it, and it left the heart in collapse. If it had remained in the cells of speculative adepts it might have been tolerated; but it was carried to the sacred desk, and doled forth to a hungry people under the species of bread and wine. No wonder nature revolted against such a dynasty. No wonder that, in disgust at such a pabulum, men cast about for a substitute, and sought it in tame Arminianism or genteel Deism.

The calculating people of our country, in certain portions of it, have long been enamoured of a system of ethics which is reducible to the rules of Loss and Gain. It is much more level to the apprehensions of such to say that two and two make four, or that prodigality makes poor, or that doing good makes profit, or that gain is godliness, or that virtue is utility, than to plead for an imperative law of conscience, or for an eternal distinction between right and wrong. The former systems came home to the business and bosoms of the calculator. Though he had learned to speak evil of Epicurus, yet he clasped Paley to his bosom; and as all men admitted that this philosopher and divine was a mighty reasoner, and a fascinating writer, so the calculator went further, and adopted his ethical heresy as the basis of all morals. Some, who could not take the system in its gross form, re-

ceived it under that modification, which appears in the theology of President Dwight. Long, therefore, before the mask was completely cast away by Bentham, Mill, and the Utilitarians of England, there were hundreds of young men who had imbibed the quintessence of the poison, through their college text-books, or through the introduction of the same principles into the received authorities of law-schools and courts of justice. We think it possible to show, that the prevalence of this degrading view of the nature of holiness, namely, the view which allows to virtue no essence but its tendency to happiness, has directly led to a laxity in private morals, to a subtlety of covert dishonesty, to an easy construction of church symbols and of other contracts, and to that measurement of all things divine and human by the scale of profit, which is falsely charged upon our whole nation by our foreign enemies. We think it possible to show that such is the tendency of Utilitarianism. And such being its tendency, we should despair of ever seeing any return from this garden of Hesperides, with its golden apples, were it not for a safe-guard in the human soul itself, placed there by all-wise Providence. For the system runs counter to nature. Reason about it as you will, the soul cannot let so monstrous an error lie next to itself; the heart will throb forth its innate tendency, and conscience will assert its prerogative. Nor will men believe concerning *virtue*, any more than concerning *truth*, that it has no foundation but its tendency to happiness; even though such tendency be as justly predicable of the one as of the other. The very consideration of what is involved in the monosyllable *ought*, is sufficient to bring before any man's consciousness the sense of a distinction between virtue and utility, between that which it is prudent to do, and that which it is right to do. In process of time, as more adventurous and reckless minds sailed out further upon this sea of thought, especially when some theologians went so boldly to work as to declare, that in turning to God, we regard the Supreme Being in no other light than as an infinite occasion of personal happiness to ourselves; when this began to be vented, thoughtful men were taken aback. They queried whither they were going. They remembered that their religious emotions had included other elements. They reconsidered the grounds of the adhesion they had given in, to Paley, to Epicurus, and to self. They paused in their rapid career and looked at the system of general consequences. And in a good number of

instances, they were ashamed of the way in which they had been trepanned out of their original ideas, and sought for something to put in the place of the idol they were indignantly throwing down. We know such men; we know that they will read these pages; men who have gone down after their guides into the vaults of the earth-born philosophy, hoping to see treasures, and gain rest to the cravings of their importunate inquiries, but who have come up again, lamenting their error, and mortified that they had been abused. These things we have said concerning the Utilitarian ethics, now prevailing under different forms in America, and chiefly in the northern and eastern states, as furnishing an additional reason for the eager search that undeniably exists, after a more spiritual, elevating, and *moral* philosophy.

In tracing the irresistible progress of thought and opinion, as it regards philosophy, we have seen two sources of that dissatisfaction which for several years has prevailed, with respect to hitherto reigning metaphysics; namely, a disrelish for the coldness, heartlessness, and fruitlessness of the New England methods, and a dread of the doctrine of Utilitarianism. It might have been happy for us, if the proposal for a change had come *ab intra*, if one of our own productive minds had been led to forsake the beaten track, and point out a higher path. But such has not been the case. It has so happened, that no great native philosophical leader has as yet arisen to draw away one scholar from the common routine. This has been very unfortunate. If we are to make experiment of a new system, we would fain have it fully and fairly before our eyes, which can never be the case so long as we receive our *philosophemata* by a double transportation, from Germany via France, in parcels to suit the importers; as fast as the French forwarding philosopher gets it from Germany, and as fast as the American consignee can get it from France. There is a great inconvenience in the reception of philosophical theories by instalments: and if our cisatlantic metaphysicians import the German article, we are sometimes forced to wait until they have learned the language well enough to hold a decent colloquy in it. Such, however, is precisely the disadvantage under which the young philosophers of America now labour. We hear much of German philosophy and of the revelations which have been made to its adepts; much very adroit use of certain disparaging terms, easily learned by heart, and applied to the old system, as "flat," "unspiritual," "empirical," and "sensuous;" we hear

much of the progress made in ontological and psychological discovery, in the foreign universities. But, if we hear truth, the hierophants of the new system among us are not so much more intimate with the source of this great light than some of their silent readers, as to give them any exclusive right to speak *ex cathedra* about transcendental points. Some of them are busily learning French, in order to read in that language any *risacimento* of Teutonic metaphysics which may come into their hands. Some are learning German; others have actually learnt it. He who cannot do either, strives to gather into one the Sibylline oracles and abortive scraps of the gifted but indolent Coleridge, and his gaping imitators; or in default of all this, sits at the urn of dilute wisdom, and sips the thrice-drawn infusion of English from French and French from German.

It might have been happy for us, we say, if the reformation in our philosophy had some root of its own in our own soil. But what is this vaunted German philosophy, of which our young men have learned the jargon? We shall endeavour to give an intelligible answer to so reasonable an inquiry. In attempting to offer a few satisfactory paragraphs on this, it is far from our purpose to profess to be adepts. We have seen a little, heard a little, and read a little, respecting it. We have even during the last fifteen years turned over one or two volumes of German metaphysics, and understood perhaps almost as much as some who have become masters; yet we disclaim a full comprehension of the several systems. The Anglo-Saxon *dummheit*, with which Germans charge the English, reigns we fear in us, after an inveterate sort. We have tried the experiment, and proved ourselves unable to see in a fog. Our night-glasses do not reach the transcendental. In a word we are born without the *Anschauungsvermögen*: and this defect, we are persuaded, will 'stick to our last sand.' We once said to a German friend, speaking of Schleiermacher, 'But we do not understand his book.' '*Understand* it!' cried the other, with amazement, 'what then? but do not you *feel* it?' We deem ourselves competent, nevertheless, to give the plain reader some notices of the progress of Transcendental Philosophy.

The German Philosophers whose names are most frequently heard in this country, and who indeed mark the regular succession of masters, are Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. It would be easy to multiply names, but these are the

men who have carried forward the torch, from hand to hand. Though there were German metaphysicians before Kant, it is needless to name them, as he borrowed nothing from them, and certainly has the merit of standing forth to propagate a system altogether underived from his countrymen. Perhaps the best way to put our readers in possession of the peculiar tenets of Kant, would be to direct them to an able syllabus of his system by Professor Stapfer, already inserted in the *Biblical Repertory* for the year 1828. But to maintain the connexion of our remarks, we shall furnish further information; and if we enter somewhat more into detail here than in what follows, it is because the transition to Kant from his predecessors is more abrupt than from this philosopher to any who succeeded him. In order to get a glimpse of what he taught, we must as far as possible lay aside all the prepossessions of the British school. We must not only cease to attribute all our knowledge to sensation and reflection, as our fathers were taught to do, but we must lay aside as unsatisfactory all the explanations of Reid and his followers respecting first truths and intuitive principles. We must no longer regard philosophy as a science of observation and induction, and must dismiss all our juvenile objections to a purely a priori scheme of metaphysics. It is the first purpose of Kant, in his own terms, to inquire "how synthetical judgments a priori are possible, with respect to objects of experience:" as, for example, how the idea of necessary causal connexion arises, when it is conceded that nothing is given by experience but the mere succession of events.* Indeed it was Hume's speculations on Cause and Effect which, as Kant tells us, first "broke his dogmatic slumbers." Proceeding from this to all the other instances in which we arrive at absolute, necessary, universal, or intuitive truths, he proves that these are not the result of experience. No induction, however broad, can ever produce the irresistible conviction with which we yield ourselves to the belief of necessary truth. "Experience (and this is the concession of Reid himself) gives us no information of what is necessary, or of what ought to exist."† In such propositions as the following, "A straight line is the shortest between two points: There is a God: The soul is immortal," &c. there is an amal-

* *Kritik d. reinen Vernunft*. Leipzig, 1818, p. 15.

† *Essay on the Active Powers*, Edinb. quarto, 1788. p. 31, p. 279, also *Intellectual Powers*, *Essay vi.* c. 6.

gamation (*synthesis*) of a subject with an attribute, which is furnished neither by the idea of the subject, nor by experience. These synthetical judgments therefore are a priori, or independent of experience; that is, there is something in them beyond what experience gives. There is therefore a function of the soul prior to all experience, and to investigate this function of the soul, is the purpose of the Critique of Pure Reason. "Let us," says Stapfer, in a happy illustration, "imagine a mirror endued with perception, or sensible that external objects are reflected from its surface; let us suppose it reflecting on the phenomena which it offers to a spectator and to itself. If it come to discover the properties which render it capable of producing these phenomena, it would find itself in possession of two kinds of ideas, perfectly distinct. It would have a knowledge of the images which it reflects, and of the properties which it must have possessed previous to the production of these images. The former would be its *a posteriori* knowledge; whilst in saying to itself, 'my surface is plain, it is polished, I am impenetrable to the rays of light,' it would show itself possessed of *a priori* notions, since these properties, which it would recognise as inherent in its structure, are more ancient than any image reflected from its surface, and are the conditions to which are attached the faculty of forming images, with which it would know itself endowed. Let us push this extravagant fiction a little further. Let us imagine, that the mirror represented to itself, that external objects are entirely destitute of depth, that they are all placed upon the same plane, that they traverse each other, as the images do upon its surface, &c., and we shall have an example of objective reality attributed to modifications purely subjective. And, if we can figure to ourselves the mirror as analysing and combining, in various ways, the properties with which it perceived itself invested; (but of which it should have contented itself, to establish the existence and examine the use;) drawing from these combinations conclusions relative to the organization, design, and origin of the objects which paint themselves on its surface; founding, it may be, entire systems upon the conjectures which the analysis of its properties might suggest, and which it might suppose itself capable of applying to an use entirely estranged from their nature and design; we should have some idea of the grounds and tendency of the reproaches which the author of the critical philosophy addresses to human reason, when forgetting the ve-

ritable destination of its laws and of those of the other intellectual faculties;—a destination which is limited to the acquisition and perfecting of experience, it employs these laws to the investigation of objects beyond the domain of experience, and assumes the right of affirming on their existence, of examining their qualities, and determining their relations to man.”

Instead therefore of examining the nature of things, the objective world without us, Kant set himself to scrutinize the microcosm, to learn the nature of the cognitive subject. In pursuing this inquiry he finds, not that the mind is moulded by its objects, but that the objects are moulded by the mind. The external world is in our thoughts such as it is, simply because our thoughts are necessarily such as they are. The moulds, so to speak, are within us. We see things only under certain conditions: certain laws restrain and limit all our functions. We conceive of a given event as occurring in time and in space. But this time and this space are not objective realities, existing whether we think about them or not: they are the mere *forms a priori*. Our minds refuse to conceive of sensible objects, except under these forms. Time and space therefore are not the results of experience, neither are they abstract ideas: for all particular times and spaces are possible, only by reason of this original constitution of the mind.*

According to this system, all that of which we can be cognizant is either necessary or contingent. That which is necessary is *a priori*, and belongs to the province of pure reason. That which is contingent is *a posteriori*, and belongs to the province of experience. The former he calls *pure*, the latter *empirical*: and it is the circle of knowledge contained in the former which constitutes the far-famed Transcendental Philosophy.†

Every English and American reader must fail to penetrate even the husk of German and mock-German philosophy, unless he has accepted the distinction between the reason and the understanding. We are not aware that the distinction ever obtained any footing in our modern English science, until the time of Coleridge, who in several of his works has striven *pugnis et calcibus* to instal it into our philosophical terminology. “The understanding,” says Kant, “is the faculty judging according to sense.” “Reason,” says

* Kritik d. R. V. p. 28——p. 43.

† Ib. p. 19.

Coleridge, "is the power of universal and necessary convictions, the source and substance of truths above sense, and having their evidence in themselves."* Resuming, then, the thread which we have dropped, the Prussian philosopher dissected the cognitive subject or soul into three distinct faculties; viz. 1st. Sense, or Sensibility. 2d. Understanding. 3d. Reason.

Sense receives and works up the multiform material, and brings it to consciousness. This it accomplishes partly as a mere 'receptivity,' passively accepting sensations, and partly as an active power or spontaneity. The Understanding is a step higher than sense. What sense has apprehended, the understanding takes up, and by its synthetizing activity (*die synthetisirende Thätigkeit*;) presents under certain forms or conditions, which, by a term borrowed from logic, are called Categories. These are twelve, classified under the heads of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Modality. Of Quantity: 1. *Unity*. 2. *Plurality*. 3. *Totality*. Of Quality: 4. *Affirmation*, or *Reality*. 5. *Negation*, or *Privation*. 6. *Limitation*. Of Relation: 7. *Substance and Accident*. 8. *Cause and Effect*. 9. *Action and Reaction*. Of Modality: 10. *Possibility and Impossibility*. 11. *Existence and Non-Existence*. 12. *Necessity and Contingency*.† Whatsoever now the understanding takes cognizance of, it knows under some of these forms; and every intellection receives the object as connected with at least four of these categories at once, from the four different classes. Kant attributed to the understanding the function of reducing multiplicity to unity. The result of this reduction to unity, in our consciousness, is a Conception (*Begriff*). All possible conceptions are produced under the twelve categories as their necessary forms. These are therefore the conditions of all thought; yet they afford no knowledge of the objects *per se*; and have not the slightest significancy independent of time and space. Time and space are the ways or forms under which objects are made sensible; and the categories are the ways or forms under which the same objects are understood (*begriffen*.)

The Reason, finally, is the sublime of human spontaneity. It takes cognizance of that which is self-evident, necessary,

* Even in German, this distinction between *Ferstand* and *Vernunft* was not always recognised. See a philological analysis of the latter term, in Herder's *Metakritik*, vol. II. p. 11. See *Kritik d. R. V. Elementarl. II. Th. II. Abth. I. Buch*.

† *Kritik der reinen V. p. 78.*

absolute, infinite, eternal. Its objects are beyond the sphere, not merely of time and space, but of all ratiocination: and it is among these objects, "above the stir and smoke of this dim spot, which men call earth," that the transcendental philosophers have most successfully expatiated. While the understanding is discursive, and collects proof, and deduces judgments, referring to other faculties as its authority, the reason is self-sufficient, intuitive, immediate and infallible in all its dictates. In the pure reason, there reside, a priori, three ideas, viz. 1. Of that which is absolute and of itself, whether subjective or objective; the former being the theme of psychology, the latter of ontology. 2. Of a supreme and independent real cause of all that is; namely, of God: this being the object of theology. 3. Of an absolute totality of all phenomena; namely, the universe, τὸ πᾶν; being the object of cosmology.

The eagerness of the philosophical public to discover how these principles might legitimately affect the interests of ethics and theology, led Kant to publish, in 1787, his *Critique of Practical Reason*. In this, as in several other similar works indicated in our volume for 1828, he declared himself, to a certain extent; still leaving it a matter of dispute among his adherents whether he was a Deist or a Christian. His adversaries assert, that his argument for the being of a God is inconsistent with his system, and unworthy of being admitted: and even his friends admit that he never gave his assent to the supernatural origin of Christianity. Nothing, however, in the whole system is more striking than the foundation which it gives to morals; for here, and no where else, Kant forsakes the character of a mere critic, and lays down absolute and final dictates of reason. There is, he teaches, an original and invariable law, residing in the depths of human consciousness, and commanding what is right. This he calls the *categorical imperative*. It urges man to act virtuously, *even at the expense of happiness*. Translated into words, it runs thus: "Act in such a manner, that the maxim of your will may be valid in all circumstances, as a principle of universal legislation."* Proceeding from this he builds his natural theology on his ethics; argues the necessity of another life and an almighty and omniscient Judge. The three

* Handle so dass die Maxime deines Willes jederzeit zugleich als Princip einer allgemeinen Gesetzgebung gelten koenne. Kritik der Practischen Vernunft. 5te Aufl. Leipz. 1818. p. 54.

"postulates of the Practical Reason," are God, Freedom, and Immortality.* It is now, we believe, generally conceded, that these moral and theological speculations, are an afterthought, a supplement to the main structure, and scarcely worthy of reverence for their consistency, however interesting as proofs of the strong leaning of their author towards the faith of his childhood. It was the desire of Kant to appear favourable to Christianity. At his day Infidelity had not grown so bold as it has since done; and it is especially worthy of consideration, that whenever Kant speaks of the Divine Being, he distinctly conveys the idea of a personal God, objectively existing, separate from nature, and independent of the cognizance of finite spirits.†

It deserves to be noticed that Kant, in pursuance of his vocation as a *critical* rather than a constructive philosopher, did not attribute to Reason those divine and active powers which later philosophers have assumed, and which are claimed for her by some of our American imitators, who, we would gladly believe, are ignorant of the apotheosis of reason which they thus subserve. The genuine Kantians have always maintained that in what their master delivered concerning the absolute and the infinite, he simply meant to attribute to pure reason the power of directing the cognitive energy beyond its nearer objects, and to extend its research indefinitely; but by no means to challenge for this power the direct intuition of the absolute, as the veritable object of infallible insight.

The chief objection which was made to the Critique of Pure Reason, and to the other works of the same author, was that they were purposely obscure; and it cannot be denied, that in addition to the inherent intricacy of the subject, the reader is greatly perplexed by a multiplicity of new-coined words, and still more by an arbitrary wresting of familiar terms to meanings remote from their common acceptance. It is partly for this reason, that Kant, like another great innovator of the age, Jeremy Bentham, has been best represented by the pens of his disciples: and that

* Kritik d. P. V. p. 213. ff

† Those who choose to pursue this subject further, will find satisfaction, in the following works, viz. Kant's Religion innerhalb der Ideen d. Menschl. Vernunft. 2te Aufl. 1792. and the reply to it, by Sartorius. Die Religion ausserhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft, u. s. w. Marburg. 1822. In this work, (p. 62) he quotes from Vincent, the following observation, which is not here out of place; 'Who can refrain from a smile, at beholding Christ and his apostles, brought into the train of philosophy, and made successively Wolfians, Crusians, Kantians, Fichtians, and Schellingians!'

aid which Bentham owed to Dumont, was afforded to Kant by Schulze, a chaplain of the king of Prussia.* This writer acknowledges however that at the time when he wrote, that is in 1791, the diction of his master still remained a hieroglyphic to the public.† In 1798, when Coleridge was in Germany, he heard much the same statement from the venerable Klopstock. "He said the works of Kant were to him utterly incomprehensible; that he had often been pestered by the Kantians, but was rarely in the practice of arguing with them. His custom was to produce the book, open it, and point to a passage, and beg they would explain it. This they ordinarily attempted to do, by substituting their own ideas. I do not want, I say, an explanation of your own ideas, but of the passage which is before us. In this way I generally bring the dispute to an immediate conclusion."‡ Coleridge, however, declares that in that very year almost all the professors in Germany were either Kantians, or disciples of Fichte, whose system is built on the Kantian: and in the twelfth chapter of the work just cited, he vindicates Kant from the charge of needless obscurity. At the same time he tells us that the disciples, during their master's life time, quarrelled about the meaning of his dicta, and that the old philosopher used to reply to their appeals, 'I meant what I said, and at the age of near four score, I have something else and more important to do, than to write a commentary on my own works.'

In spite of this obscurity, however, the Critical Philosophy assumed the empire in the German universities; but not without opposition from the highest sources. The celebrated John George Haman, uttered a touching caveat against the irreligious tendency of Kant's system. He declared, in his letters to Jacobi, and elsewhere, that the new philosophy owed many of its deductions to a mere play on words, and perplexed its readers in a maze of unwonted expressions; that the Kantian *τὸ ὄν* was a mere conception, of which the objective existence or non-existence could not be determined by reason. He warned the student of philosophy against a system of delusion, in which man is made every thing and God is made nothing: a warning infinitely more appropriate as applied to the systems which have succeeded Kant, and

* Erläuterungen ueber des Herrn Professor Kant Kritik der reinen Vernunft: von Johann Schulze, u. s. w. Koenigsberg, 1791.

† Schulze, p. 6.

‡ *Biographia Literaria*, Vol. ii. p 160. N. Y. edition.

which are proffered to the credulous complaisance of the American public.* In 1799 the still more celebrated Herder, entered the field as an antagonist, in his *Metakritik*.† Like Haman he brings the charge of perplexed language, and the misunderstanding and abuse of abstractions. He characterises the Critique of Pure Reason in general, as *transcendental mist* (transcendentalen Dunst), a *fog* of *fine-spun verbiage* (nebelichtes Wortgespinnst), calculated by means of dialectical sorcery to confound the very implement of reason, namely, language. The attention of the reader is the rather called to this judgment, as it is common to attribute the obscurity of our philosopher to some accidents of his vernacular tongue, rather than to his own phraseology; but here is the verdict of a German, a scholar, a philosopher, and a pupil of his own. If space were allowed, we might go much further, and dilate upon the denunciation of the Kantian idealism, by a number of eminent men, such as Garve, Eberhard, Tiedemann, Tittel, Nicolai, and Jacobi: of whom the first two were formally answered by Kant, while the last is the sole representative of a system which founds all philosophy in an affectionate religious faith, independent of revelation.‡

But it is time we should leave Kant, and consider his great successor. John Theophilus Fichte, who was born in 1762, and died in 1814, is thought by the initiated to have carried philosophy forward from its critical towards its scientific condition. He was familiar with Kant, and wrote in his manner, so that his first important work, published in 1792, was attributed to the great master. Kant had set out with a critical analysis of Understanding, Reason, and Judgment. Some of his followers, especially Reinhold, had started with the phenomenon of consciousness. Fichte simplified a step further, and began, not with a thing, or a faculty, but an act. Fichte, say his admirers, leaves us at the apex of the pyramid.§ True enough, but then the pyramid is upside down: the apex and support being the monosyllable I. The

* Jacobi's Schriften, Vol. I. 1781. pp. 371—390. Vol. IV. p. 31. Goethe's Dichtung und Wahrheit: Werke Vol. 26.

† Verstand und Erfahrung: eine Metakritik zur Kritik d. r. Vernunft; von J. G. Herder, Leipzig, 1799.

‡ See Jacobi von den Göttlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbarung. 2te Aufl. Leipzig. 1822: see also Rixner's Handbuch d. Geschichte d. Philosophie; Sulzbach, 1829, Vol. iii. § 143. § 144.

§ See a similar expression, in Mr. Linberg's note to Cousin's Introduction, p. 455.

notion of a thought which is its own object, and the notion of I, are identical. The *Ego* looks at itself; and thus we have the idea of *Ego* as knowing, and *Ego* as known, the intelligent and the existent I. This *Ego*, absolute and free, has regard to an object, or *Non-Ego*: it creates this *Non-Ego* by its own activity: in a word, it creates objective nature.* The whole of the Fichtean philosophy is a following out of this track. It creates the world out of the mind's act: and it regards the outward universe as nothing but a limit of our being on which thought operates; a limit, moreover, springing from the mind's creative power.† In such a system as this, what place is found for the Great Author of the Universe? Fichte replies, that the being of the Godhead, (which he holds to be identical with the active and moral *ordo mundi*) is an object not of theoretical knowledge, but of rational faith; and that this faith is purely moral. On a certain occasion, we are told by Madame de Staël, he said to his auditors that in the following lecture he would proceed to create God; an expression in perfect harmony with his principle, but one which gave just offence to the public. "According to Fichte," says Cousin in his Introduction to the History of Philosophy, "God is nothing but the subject of thought conceived as absolute; he is therefore still the I. But as it is repugnant to human thought, that the I of man, which might indeed be transferred into nature should be imposed upon God, Fichte distinguishes between a twofold I, the one phenomenal, namely, the I which each of us represents; the other is itself the substance of the I, namely, God himself. God is the absolute I."‡ Even Coleridge, who regarded Fichte as giving the first idea of a system truly metaphysical, admits that it "degenerated into a crude egoismus, a boastful and

* That our syntax, as well as our philosophy, is becoming a new affair, may be seen from the following specimen of Dr. Henry's English: "The fundamental fact of consciousness is a complex phenomenon, composed of three terms: first, the *me* and the *not me*, &c." Introd. page xx. Now if we must have nonsense, we feel that it is our privilege as descendants of Englishmen, to have it in good grammar. Apropos of this, we find some of our contemporaries quoting Plato in Cousin's version: surely our scholarship must be near its ebb! If the Greek is absolutely unintelligible, and if we have neither Sydenham nor Taylor, let us get a friend to English it for us. It is quite in the style of the French pulpit, when we find Dr. Henry citing the Vulgate, (page xxii.) "It is the Logos, the Word of St. John, which 'lighteth every man that cometh into the world:' *illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum.*" The reader must be left to divine why Dr. Henry here quotes Latin.

† Biographie Universelle, Vol. XIV. p. 486.—Rixner, Vol. iii. p. 337. ff.

‡ Linberg's Translation, page 398.

hyperstoic hostility to NATURE, as lifeless, godless, and altogether unholy: while his *religion* consisted in the assumption of a mere ORDO ORDINANS, which we were permitted *exoterice* to call God.”*

In a seeming ecstasy of admiration, the translator of Cousin's Introduction says of this system: “Fichte has, in arriving at this point, indeed reached the very summit of the pyramid of human science; and if the man lives, or has lived, who has as yet discovered a flaw in the chain of reasoning that leads to this point, I am ignorant of the fact.”† It may be observed of many of the systems with which it is sought to render our youth gradually familiar, that at the first approach they have a horrid aspect of atheism; but that the adepts have the most ingenious method imaginable of correcting this impression. There is probably not a Pantheist in America who will own the name; nor is there a greater certainty concerning things future, than that the free ingress of transcendentalism will smooth the way for the denial of all that we adore and love in the august idea of God. Fichte was at first reputed to be an atheist; and one of his works was instantly confiscated with rigour throughout all Saxony. As is usual in such cases, he and his abettors wrote appeals and apologies. Herder, then vice-president of the Weimar consistory, took part against him. All Germany rang with the quarrel. It was at this memorable crisis that Schelling arose in opposition to Fichte, in behalf of a system still more transcendental; of which more hereafter. He became the fashionable philosopher of Jena, for there are fashions in philosophy, especially in Germany. Poor Fichte fought as he could, but the public having tasted a more intoxicating beverage could never return to a flatter metaphysics. Fichte is supposed to have advanced in his later years to a more consistent idealism. He always declared that the Kantians did not comprehend their master's system: we believe as much ourselves; but, he added, that in the new system of idealism he was only giving consistent development to the principles of Kant.

It was reserved for other hands to complete the structure; or if we acknowledge that the pyramid was now complete, it afforded a test for the flight of more consistent, or more adventurous minds, into the transcendental empyrean. It

* Biographia Literaria, vol i. p. 95.

† Cousin's Introduction, by Linberg. Boston, 1832. p. 454-5.

was Frederick William Joseph Schelling, who, to use the phrases of his admirers, brought philosophy to its perfection, as the science of the Absolute. Kant had scrutinized the cognitive subject, and determined, except in regard to the moral imperative, that absolute knowledge is unattainable. Fichte followed him, and out of the productive *Ego*, created the objective world, still giving countenance however to the figment of a seeming dualism, and discriminating between the thinker and that which is thought. But Schelling, with a boldness unequalled in every previous attempt, merged all in one, and declared as the great discovery of the age, and first truth of absolute wisdom, that subject and object are one, that the *Ego* and the *Non-Ego* are identical. Knowledge and Being are no longer different. His system was therefore expressively called the system of identity, or the philosophy of the absolute.*

Here, as in a former case, we ask, what place is left for the Most High? Schelling is at no loss for an answer. God is in truth the very object of all philosophy; but it is God revealing himself in the universe. The divine being, once hidden, has a perpetual tendency to self-revelation; a process of evolution which is for ever going onward, and producing the world, or nature. It is this development which we see and feel and of which we are a part. The universe therefore becomes as important a portion of the philosophy of Schelling, as of that of the ancient Gnostics, or of Spinoza.† We do not wish to be understood as comprehending this profane modification of atheism, for we almost tremble while we write, we will not say the notions, but the expressions of men who treat of the genesis of divinity, as coolly as Hesiod

* Rixner, Vol. III. § 167.

† In the new philosophy, there is little reference had to the distinction between matter and spirit; in this respect the grand error of the ancient Greeks reappears, and the inevitable result is an inextricable tangle of physics with metaphysics. Material images are always dangerous aids in the philosophy of the mind; but the Germans are so far from being aware of this, that a large part of their statements are merely transformation of sensible images into expressions of pure thought. By running away with analogies, a puerile imagination may see resemblances between material and immaterial objects, which a puerile judgment may stamp as verities. Hence, in the system of Schelling, galvanism, electricity and magnetism have place in the very midst of psychology. Hence, in the system of Cousin, expansion and concentration become elements of mental analysis. Hence, also, England being an island, her philosophers cannot be transcendental. The ridiculous passage in which this truly French statement is conveyed, is too striking to be omitted: "England, gentlemen," says M. Cousin, "is a very considerable island; in England *every thing stops at certain limits*, nothing is there developed on a great scale." Introduction, p. 380.

of the birth of gods: yet we will proceed. In the absolute philosophy, God is a principle, not personal, but tending to personality, becoming personal (*eine werdende Persönlichkeit*); a tendency manifested in, and producing, the phenomena of the universe. This eternal development is a mighty effort towards self-consciousness; and the consciousness of human reason is indeed the consciousness of God; a state in which the absolute spirit views itself.*

This, we need scarcely say, is a highly flattering illusion to the soaring mind. The infinite chasm between heaven and earth is no more. Human action is the action of the infinite. Man can know the infinite by immediate insight, because he is himself infinite. God is all things, and all things are God: we are ourselves in God and God in us. And here the happy language of a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1829, whose article on Cousin is highly praised and largely quoted by Dr. Henry, may be cited by us, though with an intention very different from that of the latter. "In this act of knowledge, which, after Fichte, Schelling calls the Intellectual Intuition, there exists no distinction of subject and object—no contrast of knowledge and existence,—all difference is lost in absolute indifference,—all plurality in absolute unity. The intuition itself—reason—and the absolute—are identical. The absolute exists only as known by reason, and reason knows only as being itself the absolute."† As a natural consequence, this direct cognition of the absolute, the unconditioned, and the infinite, implies the annihilation of consciousness; for it is of the very essence of consciousness to conceive of the object of thought as separate from its subject. It is a further consequence that there can be no personal immortality of the soul; the hope of which he characterises as a vain solace (*eitle Freude*):‡ in return for which fond illusion, Schelling cheers us with an immortality in which the qualities of the soul re-enter into the universal mass: "an immortality," says Madame de Staël, "which terribly resembles death: since physieal death itself is nothing but universal nature reclaiming the gifts she had made to the individual."§

Such is the philosophy which up to this very hour is taught

* See Bretschneider, *Ueber die Grundansichten der theologischen Systeme* der Proff. Schleiermacher und Marheineke. Leipzig, 1828. p. 5.

† *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1829, Art. XI. p. 208.

‡ Bretschneider, *ubi supra*, p. 12.

§ *De l'Allemagne*, t. iii. p. 114, ed. Paris, 1814.

in several of the Germans universities, by Protestant teachers of religion, and to which, more alarming still, a goodly number among our neophytes in metaphysics are endeavouring to attain. But M. Cousin somewhat sneers at our apprehension of the "bugbear" Pantheism, and we may yet be called upon by American clergymen to abandon all belief in a personal God, or any Deity but the universe. It is very true, as we shall see, that M. Cousin does not avow himself to be a disciple of Schelling. It is further true, that he diverges from him in important particulars, and earnestly, though, as we think, vainly endeavours to wrest his own system into a conformity with revelation; yet his whole scheme is a conduit from the stream of German transcendentalism at the most corrupt part of its current; and his works abound with expressions which savour too strongly of doctrines more *prononcées* than those which he has avowed. In the following sentences we know not to what school he can allude, if not to that of Schelling, Oken, or Hegel:* "Fichte died in 1815, and even before his death a new philosophy, unable to stop at the system of absolute subjectivity, and the summit of the pyramid of the me, has redescended to the earth, and returned to nearer views of actual reality. The contemporaneous German philosophy, which now exerts as great an influence, and possesses as high an authority in Germany, as ever did that of Kant or Fichte, bears the title of the philosophy of nature. The title alone indicates some return towards reality."†

We have sometimes been strongly tempted to suspect that many of the enthusiastic admirers of Coleridge's prose works are entirely unaware of the extremes to which their master's principles of philosophizing would legitimately lead them. None can be more open than ourselves to impressions from the great genius and inimitable diction of this philosopher and poet: we have felt its fascinations, and in hanging over his pages, and especially his noble denunciations of the utilitarian Ethics, we have almost forgotten how indeterminate and fruitless are most of his reasonings, and how rotten the foundation of his scheme. After our declaration that the system of Schelling is a system of Pantheism, or that sort of Atheism which denies the personality of God, many will be startled when we assure them that Coleridge maintained the great principles of this very school. We dis-

* Cousin's *Introd. to Hist. of Philosophy*, page 427. Boston.

† The title of one of Schelling's works, *Ideen zur Naturphilosophie*; 1797.

claim indeed the intention of representing this learned man as having coincided with the German pantheist in all the remote consequences of his theory, however legitimate. But that the system of Coleridge and the system of Schelling are the same in their leading principles will be denied by no one who is familiar with both. Nay, we have Coleridge himself making the most ample avowal of this coincidence, for the purpose, as it should seem, of escaping the charge of plagiarism from the German philosopher. Let us hear himself; "In Schelling's 'NATUR-PHILOSOPHIE,' and the 'SYSTEM DES TRANSCENDENTALEN IDEALISMUS,' I first found a genial coincidence with much that I had toiled out for myself and a powerful assistance in what I had yet to do." And then, as if to account for the somewhat singular fact that the dissertation in the *Biographia Literaria*, on the reciprocal relations of the *esse* and the *cogitare* is a literal translation from the Introduction to a work of Schelling, he proceeds to say: "We had studied in the same school; been disciplined by the same preparatory philosophy, namely, that of Kant; we had both equal obligations to the polar logic and dynamic philosophy of Giordano Bruno," &c. &c. And again: "To me it will be happiness and honour enough, should I succeed in rendering the system itself intelligible to my countrymen, and in the application of it to the most awful of subjects for the most important of purposes."† After reading these avowals, and after having learned the ravages of this very philosophy among the present generation of clergymen in Germany, we are heartily thankful that Coleridge never summoned sufficient energy to give us any thing more than fragments; while we are filled with amazement at the sight of Christian ministers among ourselves, men of education and piety, either subscribing to statements which they do not comprehend, or giving the weight of their authority to the

* This seeming plagiarism is set in the best light of which the facts admit, in the preface to the 'Specimens of the Table Talk,' New York, 1835, p. xxv. ff. But the whole vindictory argument is singular in the history of literary borrowing. See, on the same topic, the *British Magazine*, for January, 1835.

† *Biographia Literaria*, Vol. I. p. 95, 97. The reader, in order to do justice, at once, to us in bringing so grave a charge, and to the memory of Coleridge, should not fail to consult the work here cited. On p. 169, will be found this pregnant declaration. "We begin with the I KNOW MYSELF in order to end with the absolute I AM. We proceed from the SELF, in order to lose and find all self in God." See also *The Friend*, Essay xiii. p. 76, note; likewise p. 451, ed. Burlington, 1831; likewise *Aids to Reflection*, note 50, p. 284, ed. 1829.

conclusions which by the best theologians even of Germany are denounced as incompatible with the fundamentals, we say not of Christianity, but of natural religion. Let our young metaphysicians learn from Coleridge and Cousin to tolerate and admire Schelling, and they will soon learn from Schelling himself that God is every thing.*

We almost shrink from the attempt to conduct our readers any lower down in the circling vaults of German wisdom; we have not yet reached the end, for in the lowest deep a lower deep still opens wide, in the system of Hegel and his followers.† When we speak of this professor, we shall not be scrupulous in distinguishing between his own opinions and those of his immediate and acknowledged followers; and, this being premised, it may be said that his was the system prevailing in Germany on the arrival of the last steamer.

George Frederick William Hegel was born in 1770, and died within the last three or four years. He was professor, first at Jena, and afterwards at Heidelberg and at Berlin; in the last of which chairs he succeeded Fichte, in 1818. His system purported to be an improvement on that of Schelling. It is said by the Hegelians, that in contradistinction from that of Fichte, which was a subjective idealism, and from that of Schelling, which was an objective idealism, the scheme of Hegel takes the true position as an absolute idealism.‡ Hegel, no less than Schelling, maintained universal identity, or that all things are the same: but while the former postulated this, as an intellectual intuition, the latter proceeded to prove it by a scientific process.§ Both teach, but with the same difference as to the origin of the dogma, that thought and being are identical. In his earliest work, Hegel undertook to show how the I, through manifold and multi-form self-evolutions, comes to be, first Consciousness, then Self-Consciousness, then Reason, and, finally, Self-Comprehending and Religious Spirit.||

* In all that we have written about Schelling, we have had reference to his published systems. What changes have taken place in his way of thinking within the last ten years, we have not been in a situation to know. It is, however, said that he has abandoned some of his anti-christian notions.

† *Io sono al terzo cerchio della piovra*

Eterna, maladetta, fredda, e greve.

Dante. Inferno, Canto VI.

‡ *Conversations-Lexikon, Art. Hegel.*

§ Rixner, Vol. III. p. 437. Marheineke: *Dogmatik*. §§ 1—68.

|| *Die Phaenomenologie des Geistes*: Bamberg, 1807.

All philosophy, according to Hegel, is but an attempt to answer a simple question, viz. *Quid est?* And the answer to this involves all Truth, all Reason: for whatever is, is Reason. All reality is reasonable, all that is reasonable is real. Hence the only real existence is the ideas of Reason. All reality (*Wirklichkeit*) being thoroughly rational, is also divine; yea is God revealing himself or developing himself. Nature is God coming to self-consciousness.* God reveals himself in creation, or in the universe, by a series of eternal unfoldings, some in matter, some in mind; and thus the Deity is in a perpetual effort towards self-realization.† The history of Physics is therefore the necessary career of divine self-evolution: indeed God thinks worlds, just as the mind thinks thoughts.

In order to philosophize aright, we must lose our own personality in God, who is chiefly revealed in the acts of the human mind. In the infinite developments of divinity, and the infinite progress towards self-consciousness, the greatest success is reached in the exertions of human reason. In men's minds therefore is the highest manifestation of God. God recognises himself best in human reason, which is a consciousness of God (*Gottesbewusstseyn*). And it is by human reason that the world, (hitherto without thought, and so without existence, mere negation) comes into consciousness: thus God is revealed in the world.‡

God is the Idea of all Ideas, or the absolute Idea: hence our ideal thought is divine thought, and this is no other than reason.§ “The doctrine of the being of God, is no other than that of the revelation of himself in the Idea of him.”|| “God *exists* only as knowledge (*Wissen*): in this knowledge, and as such, he knows himself, and it is this very knowledge *which is his existence*.”¶ We may therefore say with truth *God exists as an Idea*.**

* Baur: *Christl. Gnosis*. p. 672.

† Rixner, p. 444.

‡ Marheineke, *Dogmatik*. § 229. ff. Bretschneider, u. s. p. 49.

§ Bretschneider, u. s. p. 40.

|| Marheineke, § 147. p. 87.

¶ Marheineke, § 153, as cited by Bretschneider; but in our edition, the 3d, these words do not occur, but we read “*Das Seyn Gottes also ist selbst noch etwas anders, als dessen Bestimmtheit selber oder das Wissen*.” It will not seem strange to any one familiar with the present condition of philosophy, that we cite Marheineke as an authentic expounder of Hegel; it is just so to regard him, and we may presume that those points of the system which are anti-christian will, to say the least, not be exaggerated by a theological professor.

** Marheineke, *Dogmatik*. § 174, *apud* Bretschneider's *Grandansichten*, p. 43.

After thus arriving at an ideal God, we learn that Philosophy and Religion draw us away from our little selves, so that our separate consciousness is dissolved in that of God. Philosophy is Religion; and "true Religion frees man from all that is low, and from himself, from clinging to *I-hood* (Ichheit) and subjectivity, and helps him to life in God, as the Truth, and thereby to true life."* In this oblation of personal identity, we must not claim property even in our own thoughts. By a step beyond Emmonism, Hegel teaches that it is God who thinks in us; nay that it is precisely that which thinks in us, which is God. Marheineke himself manifests tokens of alarm, when he states this doctrine.† The pure and primal *substance* manifests itself as the subject; and "true knowledge of the absolute is the absolute itself." There is but a step to take, and we arrive at the tenet, that the universe and God are one.‡ The Hegelians attempt to distinguish this from the doctrine of Spinoza, but their distinctions are inappreciable; 'tis the same rope at either end they twist: their scheme is Pantheism. And as God is revealed by all the phenomena of the world's history, he is partly revealed by moral action, and consequently by sin, no less than by holiness. Sin is therefore a part of the necessary evolution of the divine principle; or rather, in any sense which can affect the conscience, there is no evil in sin—there is no sin. This is a part of the philosophy of Hegel which has given great pain to pious men in Germany, who have repeatedly complained of it as subverting the first principles of morality, not merely in theory but in practice; and begetting a fatalism which threatens alike the foundations of religion and of state. A late pantheistic poet teaches us that all which we regard as sin, is necessary, and therefore good, and may, to other intelligences, justly appear most lovely!§ But there are conclusions of the new philosophy still more surprising, for which our inchoate metaphysicians should be getting ready. It is well said by an acute writer already quoted, that when according to the demands of Schelling we annihilate first the object and then the subject, the remainder

* Bretschneider, p. 45. Marheineke, p. 83. See also Hegel's *Encyklopædie*, p. 593. ff. Baur's *Gnosis*: p. 672.

† *Dogmatik*, p. 67.

‡ Bretschneider, *Grundansichten*, p. 50. Rixner, himself a devotee to this German Buddhism cites what follows: "The knowledge of the absolute identity of God and the Universe (des Alls) is *Reason*: the crown and perfection of self-recognising and self-comprehending Reason is philosophy." Vol. iii. p. 392.

§ Schefer.

is zero.* Though Schelling is not known to have admitted this, his critics were not slow to perceive it. Schulze, in particular, declared that according to this system *Every thing is Nothing, and Nothing is Everything*;† and Köppen called this the philosophy of Absolute Nothing. It was reserved for Hegel to abandon all the scruples of six thousand years, and publish the discovery—certainly the most wonderful in the history of human research—that *Something and Nothing are the same!* In declaring it, he almost apologizes, for he says, that this proposition appears so paradoxical, that it may readily be supposed that it is not seriously maintained.‡ Yet he is far from being ambiguous. Something and Nothing are the same. The Absolute of which so much is vaunted is nothing.§ But the conclusion which is perhaps already anticipated by the reader's mind, and which leaves us incapacitated for comment, is this—we shudder while we record it—that after the exhaustive abstraction is carried to infinity in search of God, we arrive at nothing.|| *God himself is nothing!*

The German philosophy was first made known to the French by the *Allemagne* of Madame de Staël. It attracted some attention as an extravaganza of the German mind, but it made few proselytes until it was taken up by M. Cousin. It was in the year 1816 that he first commenced the importation of the German metaphysics. He had been at that time recently appointed assistant Professor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Literature at Paris. He continued to lecture until 1820, when he incurred the disapprobation of the French government, and his lectures were suspended. In 1827 he was restored to the exercise of his functions as a Professor of the Faculty of Literature, and continued to lecture until 1832, when he was made a Peer of France.¶

* Edinb. Rev. Oct. 1829. p. 208.

† Schulze's Aphorismen. p. 141 of Rixner.

‡ Hegel's Encyclopaedic, 3te Ausg. p. 103. "Seyn und Nichts ist dasselbe."

§ Ib. p. 101.

|| Ib. p. 102. ff. The same is expressly taught by Marheineke, Dogmatik, § 125, and as our allegation is too important to be left without evidence, here are his words: "In dieser Unbestimmtheit ist Gott das Gedankenlose, die noch in sich selbst beharrende, unmittelbare Einheit des Seyns und Nichtseyns und kann Alles, was von Gott bejaht wird, ebenso sehr verneint werden."

¶ Dr Henry, who seems anxious to give his readers an exalted idea of the philosophic temperament of M. Cousin, says, that "he rarely speaks in the Chamber of Peers—that he takes part in the discussions of that body only where some question relating to public instruction is before the Chamber; or on extremely rare occasions, when no good citizen should keep silence." Dr Hen-

The principal original works which M. Cousin has published are his Introduction to the History of Philosophy, comprising the course of Lectures delivered by him in 1828; and the History of Philosophy of the 18th Century, containing his Lectures for 1829. His other contributions to philosophy have been given in the form of prefaces and notes to various translations which he has published. The first of the above named works has been translated for us by Mr. Linberg; and Dr. Henry has translated and published, under the title of Elements of Psychology, that part of the other which contains M. Cousin's criticisms upon the philosophy of Locke.

It would be difficult to define precisely how far the philosophical system which Dr. Henry is seeking to domiciliate among us, agrees with the mis-shapen phantasies which we have brought before the notice of our readers. When language has ceased to be the representative of ideas, it is not easy to tell what are intended to be equivalent forms of speech. M. Cousin moreover professes to discard the phraseology of Kant, even where he adopts his ideas, and deprives us thus far of the means of recognition. But unhappily we do not find that the "way in which men express themselves in France" is any more intelligible than the dialect of "Königsberg." Even Mr. Linberg, "the accomplished translator" and admirer of Cousin, finds it difficult occasionally to understand what M. Cousin precisely means,* and M. Cousin himself now and then betrays an obscure consciousness of having "reached a height, where he is, as it were, out of sight of land."†

We are farther embarrassed in the interpretation of his system, by the material consideration that no full exposition of it has as yet been given to the world. Though it is now twenty-three years since he "first faltered the name of Eclecticism," and entered upon the establishment of a new school in philosophy, we are still left to gather its principles as they lie scattered in Fragments, Prefaces, Programmes of Lectures, and Historical Criticisms. While the system has only this

ry calculates rather largely upon the ignorance of his readers as to the transactions and debates of the French Chamber of Peers. We need only refer, in illustration of the philosophic elevation of M. Cousin, to one of the most disgraceful scenes that ever occurred in any legislative body, in which this gentleman, in the course of a debate upon the question of Spanish intervention, gave the *lie direct* to Count Molé, one of the ministry.

* Cousin's Introd. p. 450.

† Cousin's Introd. p. 123.

fragmentary existence, it is too early to pronounce of it, as Dr. Henry does, "that it is a distinct scientific theory, having its method, its principle, and its consequences."* We do not feel ourselves competent to decide upon the coherency and completeness of a system of philosophy, which has as yet received only a partial development "in its applications, by history and criticism;" nor are we willing to defer in this matter to the judgment of Dr. Henry, unless some of the letters of M. Cousin "to the present translator" contain a more full and systematic exposition of the principles of eclecticism, than is to be found in his published writings. There seems to be evidence that the translator has gained light from some quarter during the interval between the two editions of his work. In the first, when he had received no letters from M. Cousin, he says, "we come now to an important point—the *fundamental peculiarity* of M. Cousin's system; this is the two-fold development of reason." He then proceeds to explain the distinction between the spontaneous and reflective reason, which he again tells us, "constitutes and determines the peculiar system of M. Cousin."† But in his second edition we are told that it is "M. Cousin's attempt to fix the infinite as a positive in knowledge, which constitutes the chief and fundamental peculiarity of his system."‡ And again he says, "the position taken by Cousin upon this subject (the positive idea of the infinite) constitutes the chief pretension and systematic peculiarity of his philosophy."§

The applications of M. Cousin's philosophy are to us however more valuable than the scientific exposition of his principles. The formulas of transcendentalism are, in most cases, as Berkeley styled the vanishing ratios of the modern mathematical analysis, "the mere ghosts of departed quantities;" but when the truths which they are supposed to contain are applied to morals and religion, they assume a more substantial form. Here at least we can try the spirits by the test of what we already know to be true. Our only elements for a judgment upon the trackless path of German philosophy are afforded by its line of direction while within the scope of our vision.

* Dr. Henry may have sources of information that are not open to the public. He has taken care not to leave his readers ignorant that he is in correspondence with M. Cousin. It was hardly necessary to inform the public that he was "indebted to M. Cousin himself for a copy" of the highly eulogistic memoir from which he has compiled his biographical notices of this philosopher.

† *Elements of Psychology*, 1st Ed. p. XXI and XXII.

‡ *Elements of Psychology*, p. XXXI.

§ *Elements of Psychology*, p. 110.

We class M. Cousin with the German school, because the chief part of his philosophy, as far as he has developed it incidentally in its applications to history and criticism, is evidently derived from that source. In a passage already cited by us, he avows his sympathy with a particular contemporary school in Germany, in terms which draw all regards to his personal friend Hegel, and to those of his followers who have attempted to bridge over the gulf between transcendental chaos and the world we live in; and every page of his works shows that he has been "plunged in the womb of unoriginal Night and Chaos wild." But mindful of the famous saying of Fontenelle, he has opened just as many fingers of his handful of truth as he finds convenient. He glories in the name of Eclectic, and claims to be the founder of a new school which is to comprehend and supersede all others. "Our philosophy, he says, is not a gloomy and fanatical philosophy, which being prepossessed with a few exclusive ideas, undertakes to reform all others upon the same model: it is a philosophy essentially optimistical, whose only end is to comprehend all, and which therefore accepts and reconciles all."* It is a fundamental position with M. Cousin that every form of belief that has existed contains within it some truth, and he seems to be equally strong in the faith, that in his philosophical alembic every creed will part with its error. He finds in the 18th century four philosophical schools which he designates as the Sensual, the Ideal, the Sceptical, and the Mystical. Each of these schools has existed, and therefore truth is to be found in each, and can only be entirely obtained by effecting a composition between them all. But where are we to find the test that will separate the elements of truth and error combined in each of these systems? And where the principle of unity which is to group together the particular truths disengaged from each? These can only be found in a new system. But this system, according to M. Cousin's reasoning, as it exists in common with many others, can contain only a portion of truth, and the skimming process must be applied to this in common with the rest. We see no end to this method of exhaustions. M. Cousin's philosophy has in truth no better claim to the name and character of eclectic than any other system. It accepts what agrees with its own principles, and rejects what does not, and this is precisely what every other system does.

* *Introd. to Hist. of Phil.* p. 416.

If further evidence were wanting of the affectation and charlatanry of this title, it might be abundantly found in the additional reasons which M. Cousin assigns for assuming it. One of these is that consciousness demands eclecticism. And the case is thus made out. "Being, the me, and the not-me, are the three indestructible elements of consciousness: not only do we find them in the actual development of consciousness, but we find them in the first facts of consciousness as in the last; and so intimately are they combined with each other, that if you destroy but one of these three elements you destroy all the rest. There you behold *eclecticism* within the limits of consciousness, in its elements, which are all equally real, but which to form a psychological theory, need all to be combined with each other.* Another reason is that "even logic demands eclecticism," for all systems of logic turn either upon the idea of cause, or that of substance; and from the alternate neglect of one or the other of these ideas, we have the "two great systems which at the present day are distinguished by the names of theism and pantheism." Of these systems, the author adds, that "both the one and the other are equally exclusive and false."† Hence even logic demands eclecticism. But the most amusing argument which M. Cousin urges in behalf of eclecticism is that which he draws from the spirit and tendencies of the age. We cannot follow him through it as it is spread over seventeen octavo pages. He rejects from consideration England and Scotland, on the ground of their lack of philosophy, and pronounces Germany and France to be the only two nations worthy of notice. He passes in review the general state of philosophy and of society in these two nations, declaims upon the French monarchy, the revolution and the Charte‡—and at length arrives at this conclusion; "If all around us is mixed, complex, and mingled, is it possible that philosophy should be exempt from the influence of

* Introd. to Hist. of Phil. p. 418.

† Ib. p. 419.

‡ The following passage which occurs in this connexion, will give our readers some idea of M. Cousin's method of applying his philosophy to history. "You know that it is not the masses of population which appear upon fields of battle, but the ideas, the causes for which they combat. Thus at Leipzig and Waterloo the ideas which encountered each other were those of paternal monarchy and military democracy. Which prevailed, gentlemen? Neither the one, nor the other. Which was the conqueror? Which was the vanquished at Waterloo? Gentlemen, none was vanquished. No! I protest that none was vanquished; the only conquerors were European Civilization, and the Charte." We assure our readers that this is a fair average sample.

the general spirit? I ask whether philosophy can avoid being eclectic when all that is around it is so; and whether consequently the philosophical reformation which I undertook in 1816, in spite of every obstacle, does not necessarily proceed from the general movement of society throughout Europe, and particularly in France?"* There is something in all this that is either above or below our comprehension. We can readily conceive that they who see and feel its force, would find no impediment to glorying in the fancied possession of the culled wisdom of all other sects.

Before dismissing this point, it is right that we should hear Dr. Henry's account of the boastful title of the new school in philosophy. "Its *eclectic* character consists precisely in the pretension of applying its own distinctive principles to the criticism of all other systems, discriminating in each its part of truth and its part of error—and combining the part of truth found in every partial, exclusive, and therefore erroneous system, into a higher, comprehensive system."† If we rightly apprehend the writer's meaning here, it involves a strange confusion of ideas. Eclecticism, he maintains, is a distinct, scientific theory, possessing its own method and principles, and of course reduced to a system. And yet its method and principles are applied to all existing systems to gather from them the materials for a higher and comprehensive system which is to embrace the whole. The test to be applied implies the existence of a philosophical creed, and yet this creed is still to be formed from the parts of truth extracted, by the application of itself, to all others! The system of M. Cousin has, in truth, no more claim to the title of Eclectic, than any other that has ever existed. It is quite as Procrustean in its character as others, stretching or lopping off to suit its own dimensions, and differing from them, in this respect, only in its catholic pretensions.

We cannot for reasons already given undertake to put our readers in possession of M. Cousin's complete system. But one of its chief peculiarities, in the judgment of Cousin himself, and of his translator, is to be found in the distinction which he draws between the spontaneous and the reflective reason, and this we will endeavour to explain. The fundamental fact of consciousness, according to M. Cousin, is a complex phenomenon, composed of three terms, namely, the *me*, and

* Int. to Hist. of Phil. 440.

† Elem. of Psychology, p. xxx.

the *not me*, limited, bounded, finite; then the idea of something different from these, of the infinite, of unity, &c.; and again the relation of the *me* and the *not me*, that is, of the finite to the infinite, which contains and unfolds it: these are therefore the three terms of which the fundamental fact of consciousness is composed. Every man who bends his thoughts inwards, and penetrates only his own consciousness, will find there each of these three elements. If one of these terms is given, the others are given also, nor is it in the power of any man to deny any one of them. Such is now the case, but was it always thus? The distinguishing characteristic of every phenomenon, as now manifested in the consciousness, is the conviction of having tried to deny its truth, and the discovery of an inability to do so. But intelligence could not originally commence with such a denial, seeing that every denial supposes an affirmation of denying. Nor do we commence with reflection, since reflection supposes an operation anterior to itself, and cannot add any terms to those which are given by that operation. Reflection adds itself to that which was, it throws light upon that which is, but it creates nothing. There must have been therefore an instinctive development of intelligence, a perception of truth prior to reflection, and independent of the will, a pure affirmation not yet mingled with any negation. This primitive intuition contains all that will at a later period be contained in reflection:—the *me* and the *not me*,* the infinite and the finite, unity and variety, substance and phenomenon, are contained, though obscurely, in the first flashing forth of spontaneity. This is the spontaneous reason as distinguished from the reflective. The spontaneous reason seizes upon truth at first sight; comprehends and receives it, without asking why it does so. It is independent of the will, and therefore impersonal. It does not belong to us: though in us, it is not of us, it is not ours. It is absolute, and gives pure truth, and in all men the same truth. But in the reflective reason, our own voluntary activity is concerned, and here is found the source of difference and error.†

* We quote M. Cousin's description of a man's finding himself. "We do not commence with seeking ourselves, for this would imply that we already know that we exist; but, on a certain day, at a certain hour, at a certain moment,—a moment, solemn in existence!—without having sought ourselves, we find ourselves:—thought, in its instinctive development, discloses to us that we are; we affirm our existence with profound assurance,—with an assurance, unmingled with any negation whatever."—*Int. to Hist. of Phil.* p. 164.

† The preceding account of the two-fold development of reason is drawn chiefly from the sixth Lecture of the Introduction to the History of Philosophy:

Such is substantially M. Cousin's account of the distinction between the spontaneous and the reflective reason. He claims it as a discovery of his own, which he lighted upon "in the recesses of consciousness, and at a depth to which Kant did not penetrate." Kant paused at the apparent relativity and subjectivity of the laws of thought, but by diving deeper M. Cousin "detected and unfolded the fact, instantaneous but real, of the spontaneous perception of truth—a perception which not reflecting itself immediately, passes without notice in the interior consciousness, but is the actual basis of that which, at a subsequent period, in a logical form, and in the hands of reflection, becomes a necessary conception."

We can now show the reader the ground which M. Cousin's philosophy affords him for a belief in the objective existence of the world, and God. The system of Kant led to scepticism, inasmuch as it taught that all the laws of thought are altogether subjective, and the evil consequence was remedied only by assigning an illogical office to the Practical Reason. But M. Cousin has gained the same end, and saved his logic. "All subjectivity expires in the spontaneity of perception. Reason, it is true, becomes subjective by its relation to the free and voluntary *me*, the seat and type of all subjectivity; but in itself it is impersonal; it belongs to no one individual rather than another, within the compass of humanity: it belongs not even to humanity itself." Reason therefore being impersonal, it follows that it is absolute, and that the truths it gives are absolute truths. Here is the only resting-place given us for our belief in the objective existence of the finite or the infinite—the spontaneity, hence the impersonality, and hence the absolute character of reason. He who does not "possess the strength to penetrate deeply into the recesses of his own mind, to pierce through reflection, (we know not with what instrument) in order to arrive at the basis of all reflection," or who, when he has arrived at this deep place, is not fortunate enough to find there "a pure affirmation, not yet mingled with any negation, and containing in it all that has subsequently been given by reflection," has no proper evidence for the spontaneity of reason upon which this solution of the problem of the objective rests. It is to this pure affirmation, sometimes represented as "so pure that it escapes notice,"

it is perhaps a work of supererogation to say that it is given in the author's own phraseology, though abridged, since we are sure our readers will acquit us of the ability to construct it ourselves.

so bright that we can not see it, that the appeal is made in proof of what is styled, the spontaneous reason. We must therefore find this "pure affirmation" in our consciousness, or we must admit in deference to M. Cousin's logic, that it exists there, though so brightly that we cannot see it, before we can believe in any objective existence. That is, unless we have strength enough to make the discovery in the recesses of our own minds, a task to which M. Cousin acknowledges that but few men are equal, we must admit that there exists in our consciousness something of which we are nevertheless not conscious, in order to be satisfied of the objective existence of either the world or God; and we regard this as so uncertain a path for arriving at certainty, that we believe few on this side of the Atlantic will trust their feet in it:

Whom shall we find
Sufficient? who shall tempt with wandering feet
The dark unbottom'd infinite abyss,
And through the palpable obscure find out
His uncouth way?

There are some other results of the non-subjectivity of the spontaneous reason which are more startling. It is the pure affirmation, the spontaneous perception of the reason, which gives us the finite and the infinite. Whence comes this reason which enlightens us, but does not belong to us? "This principle, M. Cousin says, is God, the first and the last principle of all things." Human reason therefore "becomes divine in its own eyes." "Reason is literally a revelation, a necessary and universal revelation which is wanting to no man, and which enlightens every man on his coming into the world. Reason is the necessary mediator between God and man, the Logos of Pythagoras and Plato, the Word made flesh, which serves as the interpreter of God and the teacher of man, divine and human at the same time." There is no hesitation on the part of M. Cousin in drawing from this the conclusion that "humanity is inspired,—the divine breath which is in it, always and every where, reveals to it all truths under one form or another according to the place and the time." "Every man thinks, every man therefore thinks God, if we may so express it." "Every where present, he (God) returns as it were to himself in the consciousness of man, of which he indirectly constitutes the mechanism and phenomenal triplicity by the reflection of his own nature and of the substantial triplicity of which he is the absolute identity."*

* *Elem. of Psychol.* p. 400. See Marheineke *Dogm.* §§ 229. ff. Bretschneider, *ubi sup.* p. 49.

In human reason there are found three ideas, a triplicity in unity; the infinite, the finite, and the relation which subsists between them;—the passage from these ideas to God, says M. Cousin, is not difficult; “for these ideas are God himself.” We earnestly call attention to this as one of the most hideous heads of the pantheistic hydra. The dogmatic theologians of this sect have put it in the place of the incarnation, and the poets of ‘young Germany’ are teaching the intoxicated youth to regard themselves as sublime realizations of the divine reason. So Schefer, in his passionate verses, designates man as *the Son of God*, as *godlike*, nay, as the *God-man*; and in a phrensy of self-apotheosis proceeds to call the human head the *city of the gods*!

But to resume our thread, as in human consciousness there are found only two ideas and their connexion, forming three elements, so in nature, two corresponding laws and their connexion govern the material universe. We find in the world the same triplicity in unity as in ourselves. “The world accordingly is of the same stuff with ourselves, and nature is the sister of man.” And here we find in God, man, and the world, the triplicity in unity again, which figures so largely in the Eclectic philosophy. The unity of the three is not obscurely taught in the following passage. “The interior movement of the energies of the world, in the necessary progress of their development from degree to degree, from kingdom to kingdom, produces that wondrous being whose fundamental attribute is consciousness, and in this consciousness we have met with precisely the same elements which, subject to different conditions, we had already found to exist in nature:—the same elements which we had recognised in God himself.”* M. Cousin has not permitted the shadow of a doubt to rest upon the pantheistical tendency of his philosophy. “God, he tells us, is at once true and real, at once substance and cause, always substance and always cause, being substance only in so far as he is cause, and cause only in so far as he is substance, that is to say, being absolute cause, one and many, eternity and time, space and number, essence and life, indivisibility and totality, principle, end and centre, at the summit of being, and at its lowest degree, infinite and finite together, triple in a word, that is to say, at the same time God, nature and human-

* Introd. to Hist. of Phil. p. 158.

ity. In fact, if God be not every thing, he is nothing, if he be absolutely indivisible in himself, he is inaccessible; and consequently he is incomprehensible, and his incomprehensibility is for us the same as his destruction.”* M. Cousin has attempted to forestall the charge of pantheism, by pronouncing it the bugbear of feeble imaginations. This is a very common, and not a very creditable artifice. But we trust that there is, in our country at least, enough of this feebleness of imagination to be affrighted by the bugbear, and to shrink back with horror from such a philosophical aliment as is offered by an infidel philosophy; and the more so when we see in every new arrival of European journals, that there is scarcely a doctrine of orthodox Christianity, on which these harpies have not descended, claiming it as their own, and so defiling it by impious misuse as to give us poison under the shape of food.

No sincere and earnest inquirer after truth, humble and reverent in his self-distrust, as he must needs be, can fail to take offence at the bold and confident tone in which M. Cousin settles all questions; and especially will the pious mind recoil from his unhallowed intrusions upon the nature and essence of the Deity. He professes indeed to believe and teach the existence of God. He professes too, sad omen at the outset, thoroughly to comprehend his nature and essence. He does not pretend to deny, he pleads guilty to, the accusation of seeking “to penetrate into the depths of the Divine Essence, which common opinion declares to be incomprehensible.”† “So little is God incomprehensible, that his *nature* is constituted by ideas—by *those* ideas whose nature it is to be intelligible.” “The measure of the comprehensibility of God is the measure of human faith.” They who falter and draw back from this rushing in of fools, where angels dare not tread, are reproached with “pusillanimous mysticism.” He admits that God “is incomprehensible as a formula, and in the schools,” but we should consider that “mysticism is the necessary form of all religion”—“the symbolical and mystical form is inherent in religion”—and “to speak plainly, the religious form and the philosophical form are different from each other.” Though religion therefore must of necessity present truths under a mysterious and incomprehensible form, it is the right of philosophy to pene-

* Elem. of Psychol. p. 399.

† Introd. to Hist. of Phil. p. 132.

trate this form, and disengage the ideas; it is its duty "to comprehend nothing and to admit nothing but in so far as it is true in itself, and in the form of ideas." God exists only so far as we comprehend him. His nature is constituted by ideas, and those ideas are wholly within the stretch and compass of our reason. "I will speak," says our author, "plainly and unequivocally upon this point. Mystery is a word which belongs not to the vocabulary of philosophy, but to that of religion."*

With this for his point of departure, it is not surprising that M. Cousin should be led to reject entirely the God of the Scriptures, and substitute in his stead a shadowy abstraction. In place of the mysterious and incomprehensible Jehovah, whose infinite perfections will be the study and delight of an eternity, we have a God whose nature and essence we can now, while seeing through a glass darkly, thoroughly comprehend, and to whom faith is not permitted to attribute any thing of excellence or glory beyond what the human intellect can clearly discern. In place of the God

* Introd. to Hist. of Phil. p. 134. There is an admirable contrast between the pert self-sufficiency of M. Cousin, and the humble truth-loving spirit of the illustrious Descartes, who is honoured and lauded as the author of the Psychological Method, and the founder of the Ideal School of Philosophy. Cousin calls himself one of the sons of Descartes. Degenerate son of a noble sire! Compare the modest caution of the one with the all-embracing arrogance of the other. "Quod ut satis tuto et sine errandi periculo aggrediamur, eâ nobis cautela est utendum, ut semper quam maxime recordemur, et Deum auctorem rerum esse infinitum, et nos omnino finitos. Ita si forte nobis Deus de se ipso, vel aliis aliquid revelet, quod naturales ingenii nostri vires excedat, qualia jam sunt mysteria Incarnationis et Trinitatis, non recusabimus illa credere, quamvis non clare intelligamus; Nec ullo modo mirabimur multa esse, tum in immensa ejus natura, tum etiam in rebus ab eo creatis, quae captum nostrum excedant."—*Princ. Phil.* § xxv.

Another truly great man, of the same age, in urging the use of reason in theology, addresses to those who employ this noble talent in all other matters, but hide it under a bushel when they come to the study of God and of his word, the expostulation, "Cave, cave, ne quondam a te rigide satis rationes exigantur tam male collocati tui talenti." But he immediately adds, "Scio quam maxime, nec opus est ut monear, plurima esse, quae Deus in verbo suo nobis revelavit, captum nostrum infinities superantia, qualia sunt momentosissima fidei capita de S. S. Trinitate, de eterna generatione filii, de ejus incarnatione, de resurrectione mortuorum,—haec sane credidi, credo, et per gratiam Dei semper credam, quia ea revelare mihi dignatus est."—*Joh. Bernouilli, Opera*, Vol. I. p. 196.

We could quote much to the same effect from Leibnitz, to whom M. Cousin does homage "as the greatest authority among modern philosophers." These were men who were seeking, with passionate earnestness, after truth: they were not founding new schools in philosophy. They were men of large powers and large attainments, and could afford to confess ignorance, where it is folly to be wise.

of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God to whom his people, in all ages, have fled for refuge, crying, do *Thou* deliver me and save me, we are presented with a vague personification of abstract principles, with a God who is described as the reason; thought, with its fundamental momenta; space, time, and number; the substance of the *me*, or the free personality, and of the fatal *not me* or nature; who returns to himself in the consciousness of man; of whose divine essence all the momenta pass into the world, and return into the consciousness of man; who is every thing, and it might, with equal significance, be added nothing.

With this notion of God no one will contradict the position frequently assumed by M. Cousin, that Atheism is impossible. Who can deny the existence of reason, of thought, of the world? And if he cannot deny these he cannot deny God, for these are God. It is substantially upon this ground that M. Cousin rests the impossibility of Atheism. "Every man believes in his own existence, every man therefore believes in the existence of the world and God. Every man thinks, every man therefore thinks God. Every human proposition contains God: every man who speaks, speaks of God, and every word is an act of faith and a hymn. Every assertion, even though negative, is a judgment which contains the idea of being, and consequently, *God in his fullness*."* To the same effect we are told "that all thought implies a spontaneous faith in God, and natural Atheism has no existence." Every man who believes that he exists, believes all that is necessary. "If he believes this, I am satisfied; for if he believes that he exists, he then believes that his thought,—that he believes his existence—is worthy of faith; he therefore places faith in the principle of his thought;—now, *there is God*."† Even the sceptic who doubts every thing, is not to be brought as an objection to this doctrine. For does he deny that he denies? Does he doubt that he doubts? If he only affirms that he doubts, in that affirmation there is included faith in himself and in God. Behold then all men converted into believers—respect humanity, for all its members acknowledge the same God;—impute atheism to no man, for every man speaks, and each word is an act of faith in God; every man believes his own consciousness, and it is in human consciousness that God returns to himself; "human consciousness is like the divine essence which it

* Elem. of Psych. p. 401, 402.

† Introd. to Hist. of Phil. p. 174.

manifests." Such is the practical conclusion of this philosophy. And we admit its justness. It is logically connected with the premises. With the notion of God given us by M. Cousin, atheism is indeed impossible. And so is it impossible under any scheme of idolatry which assumes an object in the existence of which all men must of necessity believe, as its God. The African, having established that his *fetish* is God, will have no difficulty in proving that all men, or as many at least as believe in the evidence of their senses, believe in God. Atheism is a term that bears relation to the true God revealed in the Bible, to the God that is found under the "venerable form of religion," and the philosophy that approaches this form to disengage the idea of God, and change it to a new one, though it comes with many expressions of "profound respect and veneration," and with all the deferential and smirking politeness of a French *petit maitre*, is essentially atheistic in its character, and as such should be held in equal abhorrence with the open and frontless denial of God. M. Cousin, to do him justice, never fails in polite respect towards religion: he even refers, with evident approbation, to the pious politeness "of the octogenary author of the *Système du Monde*, (*an Atheist*), who bowed and uncovered his head, whenever God was named," But when a man robs us of our God, it is but little matter whether he does it with an open and rude violence, or with a smooth and complaisant legerdemain.

The idea of creation is of necessity modified by the idea of God. What is it to create? After stating and repudiating the "vulgar definition, which is, to make something out of nothing," M. Cousin proceeds to seek the true conception of this act among the facts of consciousness. "To create," he says, "is a thing which it is not difficult to conceive, for it is a thing which we do at every moment; in fact we create whenever we perform a free action.—Here is the type of a creation. The divine creation is the same in its nature. God, if he is a cause, can create; and if he is an absolute cause, he cannot but create; and in creating the universe he does not draw it forth from nothingness but from himself. God therefore creates, he creates by virtue of his creative power; he draws forth the world not from nothingness, which is not, but from him who is absolute existence. An absolute creative force, which cannot but pass into act, being eminently his characteristic, it follows, not that creation is possible but that it is necessary: it follows that

God is creating without cessation and infinitely, and that creation is inexhaustible, and sustains itself constantly.”* M. Cousin, on one occasion, intimates that he knows “he is speaking in 1828, and not in 1850,” and we presume a decent regard for the prejudices of the age in which his lot is cast, prevented him from stating an immediate inference from the principles here laid down. If it be the most eminent characteristic of God that he is an absolute creative force that cannot but pass into act, we are driven to believe in the eternal creation of the world, or rather in the eternal co-existence and oneness of God, and the universe. The possibility of a creation, in the strict and proper sense of the term, is denied by M. Cousin at the outset. He says that “Leucippus, Epicurus, Bayle, and Spinoza, and indeed all others whose powers of thought are somewhat exercised, demonstrate, that out of nothing, nothing can be drawn forth; that out of nothing, nothing can come forth; whence it follows that creation is impossible. Yet by pursuing a different route our investigations arrive at this very different result, viz, that creation is, I do not say, possible, but necessary.” And what is this different route which conducts from the same premises to so opposite a conclusion? It is, as we have seen, by changing the meaning of the word. It is by narrowing the term to signify only what we every moment do, what every cause, now in action, does. By confounding creation with causation, and defining God to be a creative force that could not but pass into act, either Leucippus or Spinoza might have proved as clearly as M. Cousin has done, that creation, so far from being impossible, is both possible and necessary. That they did not arrive at this “different result,” should be imputed perhaps rather to their candour, than to their want of penetration.

If the maxima “*nihil posse creari de nihilo*” be received as universally true, and applied in limitation of the Divine power, as well as human, creation is of course impossible. Creation is the making of something out of nothing, and if this cannot be done there can be no creation. We find matter now in existence. Unless it has existed eternally, there was a time when it did not exist. It must then have been formed either of something already existing, which by hypothesis is not matter, that is, of spirit, or it must have been formed of nothing. But matter cannot be a modified form

* *Introd. to Hist. of Phil.* p. 136—142.

of spiritual existence, and according to M. Cousin, it cannot be drawn forth from nothing. The only legitimate conclusion to which we can arrive from these premises is, that matter does not now exist, or that it has had an independent existence from eternity, or that it is an emanation from the Deity. The latter opinion seems to be the one held by M. Cousin. The material universe, he teaches us, was not formed out of nothing;—God drew it forth from himself. “We may, he says, go further. The creations of God are from himself; therefore he creates with all the characteristics which we have recognised in him, and which pass *necessarily* into his creation.”* We find too the following passage in his preface to the second edition of the Philosophical Fragments, translated by Dr. Henry, and appended to the Elements of Psychology. “God exists for us only in the relation of cause; without this, reason would not refer to him either humanity or the world. He is absolute substance only inasmuch as he is absolute cause; and his *essence* consists precisely in his creative power.”† M. Cousin’s theory of Cosmogony is now quite plain. The essence of God is his creative power. He is an absolute force, subjected to a necessity of acting, and of developing in its effects those characteristics and those alone which are found in itself. God is made the mere living force, the *vis viva*, of the universe, and all things are but the radiations and effluxes of this primary and interior energy. This is the theory taught, if we may credit the Hermetic Fragments, by the ancient Egyptians, and which is at this day held both by the Brahmins and Buddhists of the East. Among all the ancients, unless the Tuscans be an exception, the creation of something out of nothing was held to be a palpable absurdity. It was a common article in all the different creeds of Grecian and Roman philosophy that “*gigni de nihilo nil, in nihilum nil posse reverti.*” This led to two different theories of the origin of the visible universe, either of them exclusive of a creation properly so called. The one, that of most of the Greek schools, which taught the eternity, and independent existence of matter. The other, that of the oriental systems, which represented the universe as an emanation from within the Deity. Thus in the Yajur Veid, as translated by Du Perron, it is said: “The whole universe is the Creator, proceeds from the Creator, exists in him, and returns to him.

* Introd. p. 142.

† Elem. of Psych. p. 408.

The ignorant assert that the universe, in the beginning, did not exist in its author, and that it was created out of nothing. Oh, ye whose hearts are pure, how could something be made out of nothing? This first Being alone, and without likeness, was the *all* in the beginning: he could multiply himself under different forms; he created fire from his essence, which is light, &c." This doctrine was early carried into Greece, and adopted by many of their philosophers. It is found in the Orphic remains, especially in the poem *de Mundo*, as quoted by Aristotle and Proclus, in Aeschylus, and in most of the Greek poets. It seems to have special affinities for poetry. In modern times it has made its reappearance in the polished periods of Pope's *Essay on Man*, and it runs through the wild and impious imaginations of Shelley.* Under the poetic dress this system is more tolerable, because we can ordinarily make such deductions for poetic imagery as will bring it within the compass of truth. But when in the grave language of didactic philosophy we are told that the very essence of God is his creative power; that he is a force that was compelled to act and to pass with all his characteristics into the visible world; and that nothing now exists which has not from eternity existed in God; we are concerned, we are alarmed. This necessary transfusion of God into the universe destroys our very idea of God.† He is made the substratum, the substance of all existence; and we are only bubbles thrown up upon the bosom of the mighty ALL, to reflect the rainbow colours, in our brief phenomenal existence, and then be absorbed again into the ocean from which we came.‡

It will have been already anticipated from the exposition we have given, that M. Cousin's philosophy makes sad havoc with Christianity. He is indeed studiously polite to Christianity as well as to natural religion. "He knows that he is speaking in 1828, and not in 1850." This knowledge it is,

* Wordsworth occasionally borders on the very extreme of poetic license upon this subject. The philosophical principles of the *Essay on Man* were dictated by Bolingbroke, and it is supposed that Pope was not himself sufficiently aware of their tendency.

† If La Place had only personified under the name of God, the forces with which the attenuated matter of his *nebular* hypothesis was supposed to be endowed, he might, with as much justice as M. Cousin, have escaped the imputation of Atheism.

‡ The fittest symbolical form that has ever been given to this creed is that of an oriental sect, who represent the Deity as an immense spider seated at the centre of the universe, and spinning forth all things from his own body.

doubtless, that draws from him his kind and forbearing indulgence towards Christianity,—his patience, with its slowness of movement,—nay, his condescending patronage. “Christianity is the philosophy of the people. He who now addresses you sprang from the people, and from Christianity; and I trust you will always recognise this, in my profound and tender respect for all that is of the people and of Christianity. Philosophy is patient; she knows what was the course of events in former generations, and she is full of confidence in the future; happy in seeing the great bulk of mankind in the arms of Christianity, she offers, with modest kindness, to assist her in ascending to a yet loftier elevation.”* And again, he says, “I believe that in Christianity all truths are contained; but these eternal truths may and ought to be approached, disengaged, and illustrated by philosophy. Truth has but one foundation; but truth assumes two forms, mystery, and scientific exposition; I revere the one, I am the organ and interpreter of the other.”† Infidelity has, in most cases, assumed this guise of philosophical explanation of the truths of Christianity. Hume proposed only to place faith upon its proper foundation; and even Voltaire and the French Encyclopedists professed to be rendering true service to Christianity, while they were seeking to sap its foundations and overwhelm it with utter ruin. But unless it be to blind the eyes, and evade the arm of the ecclesiastical power, which in Catholic countries holds watch over the press, we see not what good purpose can be effected by so thin a disguise as that assumed by M. Cousin.‡ He surely cannot imagine that the most ordinary intelligence could fail to penetrate the flimsy hypocrisy. He comes down from the heights of philosophy, to meet Christianity in her helplessness and aid her in ascending to a loftier elevation! Though tolerant of her past slowness, yet knowing that she must move more rapidly to meet the wants of the future, he comes, with modest kindness, to disburden her of her mys-

* *Introd. to Hist. of Phil.* p. 57.

† *Introd. to Hist. of Phil.* p. 442.

‡ Among those whom we look to as readers of such articles as this there are some who are turning their steps to the enchanted ground of German literature, either in its primitive or its secondary and Gallicized division. Let us with all the earnestness of disinterested dread caution the young American. Under the disguises of romance and poesy, he will learn to tolerate the hell-born dogmas of the *young Germany*; the mingled lust and blasphemy of Heine, Pückler Muskau, and Schefer; or, if he wander in these domains as a theologian, the Iscariot Christianity of the disciples of Schelling, Hegel, and Daub.

teries, and quicken her steps! He presents himself as an interpreter, in scientific exposition, of a revelation from God, and the canon which he brings in his hand and openly exposes, is to admit nothing which this revelation contains as truth, unless by falling back upon our own pure reason we find it to be true in itself and in the form of ideas! In his solution of the mystery of the Incarnation, in which Reason is declared to be the Word made flesh, we have both proof and warning of the kind of assistance which Christianity may expect at his hands. All the sacred mysteries of revelation dwindle, in like manner, under his profane touch, into the stale truths of our own consciousness. Locke encounters the sneers of M. Cousin because he had not discovered this mode of making Christianity easy. Speaking of the appeals made by Locke to Christianity, to revelation, and to faith, he says, "By faith however and by revelation, he does not understand a philosophical faith and revelation. This interpretation did not exist in the age of Locke. He understands faith and revelation, in the proper orthodox, theological sense."* If we have a just idea of the temper of Locke, he would have scorned to avail himself of this slippery and deceptive interpretation. It is an ungracious task to be alarmists, and we should shun the office if only some specialties of this or that sect were at stake, and not, as we believe, the very basis of all religion and morals. Socinianism is evangelical when compared with the newest theology of Germany.

M. Cousin's patronage of Christianity becomes sometimes ludicrous. He declares, with gravity, that "it is the best of all religions, and it is the most accomplished of all." He assigns a reason for its accomplishments. It is this, "that the Christian religion is that which of all other religions came last; and it is unreasonable to suppose that the religion which came last should not be better than all others, should not embrace and resume them all."† The perfectibility of the human species is a cardinal doctrine with M. Cousin. Humanity is ever in the right; and its progress is steadily onward and upward. Each age is an improvement on its predecessor, and every new system is superior to all that have gone before it. The inferiority of Christianity will therefore be demonstrated, should the general apostacy which some predict take place after its universal prevalence.

We need not seek in the remote deductions and results of

* *Elem. of Psych.* p. 213.

† *Introd. to Hist. of Phil.* p. 339.

M. Cousin's philosophy for evidence of its irreconcilable hostility to Christianity. In its first principles it overthrows the foundation of divine revelation. The spontaneous reason, we are told by M. Cousin, is God, and the truths given by it are "literally a revelation from God." And since this reason is found in all men, "humanity is inspired." The original fact of affirmation, which is found by M. Cousin in human consciousness, beneath reflection, and anterior to all negation, and upon which he relies for proof of the existence of the spontaneous reason, "this fact it is, which the human race have agreed to call inspiration." This inspiration is attended always by enthusiasm. "It is the spirit of God with us: it is immediate intuition, as opposed to induction and demonstration: it is the primitive spontaneity opposed to the ulterior development of reflection."* As neither the senses or the will are concerned in this primitive act of pure apperception, we cannot refer it to ourselves. Therefore, "when man is conscious of the wondrous fact of inspiration and enthusiasm, feeling himself unable to refer it to himself, he refers it to God; and gives to this original and pure affirmation the name of revelation. Is the human race wrong?† When man, conscious of his feeble intervention in the fact of inspiration, refers to God the truths which he has not made, and which rule over him, does he deceive himself? No, certainly not; for what is God? I have told you; he is thought in itself, with its fundamental momenta; he is eternal reason, the substance and the cause of the truths which man perceives. When man therefore refers to God that truth which he cannot refer either to this world, or to his own personality, he refers it to him to whom he ought to refer it; and this absolute affirmation of truth, without reflection,—this inspiration,—enthusiasm,—is veritable revelation."‡ All men are inspired, and all are inspired in an equal degree. This spontaneity of reason, which is to all men a veritable revelation from God, "does not admit of essential differences." It gives pure truth, and in all men the same truth. "Every where, in its instinctive and spontaneous form, reason is equal to itself, in all the genera-

* *Elem. of Psych.* p. 301.

† The deification of collective humanity is regarded by many in Germany as the regenerative principle of our age. The fashionable pantheism of Berlin teaches that 'whatever is (in politics) is right;' a blessed creed for the courtiers of an absolute monarch; and which when applied to morals, forbids us, as does a living poet, to dim our mind's eye with any tears of penitence; for all hatred is only love seen on the wrong side!

‡ *Introd. to Hist. of Phil.* p. 165, 166.

tions of humanity, and in all the individuals of which these different generations are composed.”* It is too plain for argument, that these principles destroy all that is peculiar and valuable in the Sacred Scriptures. The distinctive claim which they put forth, of containing a revelation from God, is set aside by a similar claim on behalf of every man. Humanity is inspired in all its members, and revelations of truth are made to all men in nearly equal degree. When holy men of God spake of old, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, they were but giving utterance to the visions of the spontaneous reason, and the truths declared by Christ and his Apostles were from God only in the same sense in which all our own intuitions of truth are from God. The Koran is of equal authority with the Bible; all pretended revelations have one and the same authority, that is, the self-evidence of the truths which they contain. The Gospel of Christ is thus stripped of its high prerogative as a special message from God; and holy prophets and apostles, nay our Saviour too, were deceived in supposing that they had any other kind of communication with God, than that which every man enjoys. No special revelation could, according to this philosophy, be accredited to the world. No messenger or interpreter could be furnished for a divine mission among men. The truths revealed to any one man through the operations of his instinctive reason, and by him proclaimed to others, cannot be received except by such as find the same truths in their own spontaneity of reason. And the only way therefore by which God could make known his will, and give it authority among men, would be by enlarging the spontaneous reason of every man. At precisely this point the extremes of flat Rationalism, and the philosophy of the Absolute come together. Their osculation is seen in Strauss’s “Life of Jesus,” which has almost convulsed the religious world in Germany. Marheineke and Rühr, like Herod and Pilate, agree only when the Son of God is to be crucified. Would to God that our fellow Christians in America, before abandoning as shallow the philosophy of the great English fathers, would take the trouble to examine the issues of the paths on which they are entering! Let us have any philosophy however shallow, that leaves us in quiet possession of the Gospel, rather than the dark and hopeless bewilderment into which we are thrown by the deep metaphysics of M. Cousin. We say to

* *Intro.* p. 174.

him and to Dr. Henry, in the language of Edmund Burke, "If our religious tenets should ever want a further elucidation, we shall not call on infidelity to explain them. We shall not light up our temple from that unhallowed fire. It will be illuminated with other lights. It will be perfumed with other incense, than the infectious stuff which is imported by the smugglers of adulterated metaphysics."

They who are accustomed to look to the sanctions of religion for the chief support of morality, will naturally surmise that M. Cousin is not unduly strict in his ethical code. When God is made to be thought, reason, space, time and number, there is not much room left for the commission of any serious offences against him. If humanity is inspired, there is no reason to doubt that humanity will always be in the right. We accordingly find that under the cheerful philosophy of M. Cousin it is a crime to "blaspheme humanity." Forms of government or of religion which have extensively prevailed could not have subsisted without the consent of humanity, and though it is our privilege to criticise, we are taught that it would be wrong to condemn them. The spirit of each particular age, the temper of each system of philosophy, in short, every thing which has existed through the concurrence of humanity, is right; "it has its apology in its existence." We are warned not to "accuse humanity," by condemning religious or political laws which have had the confidence and sympathy of the masses of mankind. "To imprecate power (long and lasting power), we are told, is to blaspheme humanity; to bring accusations against glory, is nothing less than to bring accusations against humanity, by which it is decreed. What is glory, gentlemen? It is the judgment of humanity upon its members; and humanity is always in the right."* No appeal can be taken from the judgment of humanity, for "its judgment is infallible."†

We are thus led to a conclusion which M. Cousin does not scruple to avow and apply, that success is the criterion of moral excellence. He sets it down as "the peculiar characteristic of a great man, that he succeeds." He proves that in every battle which has ever taken place, "the vanquished party deserved to be vanquished—that the victorious party was the better, the more moral party; and that therefore it was victorious."‡ This singular demonstration may be

* *Intro.* p. 309.

† *Intro.* p. 310.

‡ *Intro.* p. 282.

summed up in a single sentence, which we extract. "Courage is a virtue which has a right to the recompense of victory,—weakness is a vice, and, inasmuch as it is so, it is always punished and beaten."* Examination and reflection, we are told, will convince us, in every case, that "the vanquished ought to have been vanquished," and that our sympathy and applause should be "on the side of the victor, for his is the better cause."

We have never seen the odious maxim, *Whatever is, is right*, pressed to a more insane extent, than is given to it in M. Cousin's philosophy. It is this abominable principle which breathes into his system the cheerful inspiration upon which he so much loves to dwell. We may indeed thus learn to be cheerful under any aspect of affairs, we may bow the knee to any religion, we may cordially embrace any form of government, we may shout in the procession of any conqueror, we may rejoice with the successful oppressor, and insult the oppressed with the truth that he deserves to suffer,—but at what expense do we purchase this easy and cheerful temper! What a sacrifice of the tender charities of our nature, what a dreadful perversion of truth and conscience does it involve! We must first learn to believe what M. Cousin indeed distinctly teaches, that prudence, courage and strength, though united with ambition, revenge, cruelty and rapacity, constitute a moral excellence that deserves to triumph over imprudence and weakness, though associated with the greatest mildness, forbearance, and benevolence. We would rather weep sometimes with those that weep, than have our tears thus stayed.

There is to us a dark and dreary fatalism pervading M. Cousin's system, of which symptoms have already appeared in the extracts we have given. He does not indeed teach what is commonly meant by fatalism. He is a strenuous advocate for the freedom of the will, and talks much of our free personality. But then this freedom itself is but one of the products of a deeper fatalism which pervades the universe, and works out its results in all things. The mechanical theory of the French atheists, which was the product of the philosophy of sensation, and the ideal theory of the Transcendentalists arrive, in this respect, though by different

* *Introd.* p. 283.

routes, at much the same conclusion. And though each brings with it somewhat of the dust of the road by which it has come, there is not much to choose between them. The one is indeed more refined and *spiritual* than the other. We hear less of the working and grinding of the machinery. It is an abstract and ideal mechanism to which it subjects us, but still a mechanism. All things are moved on by a resistless destiny. Even God is represented as a creative force, which could not but pass into act. And again, we are told, "God could not remain in a state of absolute unity; that absolute unity, that eternal substance, being a creative force, could not but create.*" Cousin teaches us that every man who exists is but the exponent of some pre-existing necessity; that every book that is written is but the realization of an idea that must needs take this form, and that every thing which occurs represents an idea which could not but be represented at that precise time, and in that very manner. After a full exposition of the *a priori* demand for a Universal History, he concludes, "hence the necessity of Bossuet." The idea had been ripening for some time, and at length there was an imperative necessity for it to put on a concrete form, and it immediately assumed it in the person of the Bishop of Meaux. Nor is this all. It was not only necessary that Bossuet should come into existence at this precise moment, and that he should write a Universal History, but his plan also was subject to necessity. After a full account of the *a priori* urgency of an idea upon this subject, we are told, "hence, gentlemen, the necessity of Bossuet's plan." We have then an account of the necessity which called into being and set at work in their respective functions, Vico, Herder, Tenneman, and others. It would seem as if there had been some difficulty in finding concrete habitation for the abstract necessities of the Cartesian philosophy. Descartes himself was the product of a necessity which grew out of the dependence and subjection of the scholastic systems. It was necessary that there should be a revolution, in which reason might shake off the shackles of authority and enter upon the true method of philosophizing. And Descartes came to represent this idea. But then Descartes was a gentleman and a soldier; Malebranche was a monk, Berkeley an eminent bishop, Spinoza a recluse, and Leibnitz

* Introd. to Hist. of Phil. p. 303.

a statesman. There was therefore a necessity, in the Cartesian philosophy, for a great professor: "this was the place and destiny of Wolf."*

There is a wider domain, and a stricter rule given by M. Cousin, to this destiny, than is conceded by most even of fatalists. Not only do all men, and especially great men, represent ideas which it was necessary should find their representation in them, but "every place represents an idea." There is nothing in the world which has not its necessity for existing, and which does not therefore represent an idea. "Yes! gentlemen, says our author, give me the map of any country, its configuration, its climate, its waters, its winds, and the whole of its physical geography; give me its natural productions, its flora, its zoology, &c. and I pledge myself to tell you, *a priori*, what will be the quality of man in that country, and what part its inhabitants will act in history,—not accidentally but necessarily, not at any particular epoch, but in all: in short—what idea he is called to represent." The philosophy which denies that "all things hold and bind each other together, which emancipates man in any degree from the laws of brass and iron which work so effectually upon him even through nature, that "the existence of a particular country determines the existence of a particular people," is branded as a "sentimental and pusillanimous spiritualism, which, though well enough adapted to the minds of children and of women, would not be less fatal to science than materialism itself."†

M. Cousin has a reason, aside from the principles of his philosophy, for being a fatalist. "All great men, he says, have been fatalists." And as he has provided the way, in all other respects, for his being a great man, it would hardly answer for him to fail here. "A great man, he informs us, is a general idea, concentrated in a strong individuality, so that its generality may appear without suppressing his individuality." From this definition of a great man he infers that no priest, prophet, or pontiff, can be great, since their existence consists in their relation to the God whom they announce: with them "God is every thing, and man is noth-

* Introd. p. 240. The inference is obvious: there still remained a necessity in the philosophy of the age for a "peer of France;" Quere: Does the same principle of necessary emanation from the age and circumstances hold in the case of translations? Or could M. Cousin, by an inverse method, declare the horoscope of his admirers?

† Introd. p. 242.

ing;" "sacerdotal castes destroy individuality, for in them nothing appears but the name of the caste, and the name of the caste is the name of its God." Therefore it appears that no priest, and by parity of reason, no religious man, in whom the idea of the infinite prevails over the finite, and to whom "God is every thing, and man nothing," can be a great man. War and philosophy are the only two lines of life which are favourable to the development of great men. "Who are they, he asks, who have left the greatest names among men? They are those who have done their countrymen the greatest good, who have served them most effectually; that is, who have made the greatest conquests, for the ideas which in their century were called to dominion, and which then represented the destinies of civilization; that is, *who have gained the most battles.*"* But M. Cousin is not a warrior, except in the bloodless conflict of ideas, and it would not do to limit greatness to war. We have, in consequence, another demonstration, concluding, "therefore the great philosopher is, in his time and in his country, the ultimate perfection of all other great men, and together with the great captain he is the most complete representation of the people to whom he belongs."† The way is therefore open to M. Cousin. But it is "the peculiar mark of a great man that he succeeds." And M. Cousin has succeeded: for the "name of eclecticism, whether chosen well or ill, begins for some time since to be somewhat spread abroad, and to resound in France, and elsewhere."‡ Does not all the world, too, know that M. Cousin has been made a Peer of France. Without doubt, he has succeeded. What is further necessary? Why "all great men have in a greater or less degree been fatalists."§ And he has given sufficient proof that he labours under no lack of this qualification.

Let us again pause for a little season, and looking back upon our dreary way, take in at one retrospective survey so much of the field as may include the German, the French, and the mongrel philosophies. They are districts of the same kingdom; alike in arrogance, in nonsense, and in impiety.

Campbell has a chapter in his philosophy of Rhetoric, intended to point out the cause of the fact that nonsense so often escapes being detected, both by the writer and by the reader; but he did not live to see what we have seen. Grosser absurdities than those which may be selected from

* Introd. p. 321.

† Ib. p. 323.

‡ Ib. p. 414.

§ Ib. p. 305.

the German, and the mock-German metaphysics, we believe the world never beheld; and these not in scattered places, but for page after page, and chapter after chapter. The Germans of the Transcendental School complain that we of the Anglo Saxon race are dull, terrestrial, and shallow; their defect is equally unfortunate, for no one of them has the faculty for desecrating an absurdity, as such. The grossest and most drivelling nonsense, which could be expressed in a jargon of words, would probably to a transcendentalist exhibit nothing ridiculous, and perhaps something august. Except the Philosophy of the Absolute, few things can be imagined more ludicrously and disgustingly absurd than the revelations of Böhme; or Jacob Behmen, as we more familiarly call him. Yet these ravings of the inspired shoemaker are regarded with "affectionate reverence,"* not only by Schelling but by Coleridge; and, more amazing still, have conducted in no small degree to the production of the modern philosophy, as has been proved and acknowledged.†

In the land of their prevalence these systems have been frequently compared to the dreams of the early Gnostics, and the resemblance is too striking to escape any one versed in church-history; as has been to our knowledge admitted by some of those concerned. The very name *Gnosis* reminds one of the claim to direct knowledge of the absolute; but the parallel may be carried out in almost every particular of the two classes of opinion. This has been done in a profound manner by the learned Baur, in his work on the Gnosis of the Christian church. He has traced out at full length the horrid pictures of the Valentinians, and the Ophites; of Marcion and the admirers of the Pseudo Clementine Homilies; he has set over against this the portraiture of Böhme, of Fichte, of Schelling, and of Hegel; and, comparing their respective lineaments, has revealed a likeness as striking as it is frightful. This he does moreover not as an enemy, but as an adoring devotee of the new theogony. He shows the remarkable coincidence between Schelling and Böhme, and between both and the Gnostics; and he makes the analogy no less apparent in the case of Hegel.‡ In all these schemes, the ini-

* Thus Coleridge speaks of Jacob Behmen, Biogr. Liter. vol. i. p. 96, see also p. 90.—Baur's *Gnosis*, pp. 557—611.—Heinroth: von d. Grundfehlern der Erziehung, 1828, p. 415.

† We observe two new biographies of Jacob Böhme, among the latest German works.

‡ Die christliche Gnosis, oder die christliche Religions-Philosophie in ihrer

tiated are incited to an esoteric vision of truth, a Gnosis which the common herd cannot attain: in all, the promise is, Your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. The conflicting sects agree in this, and in a consequent contempt for what they call popular, experimental, or empirical philosophy.* As there are certain limits to intellectual powers, which the immortal Locke endeavoured to ascertain, and beyond which we float in the region of midnight, so those who have forgotten these cautions have in their most original speculations only reproduced the delirium of other times, which in the cycle of opinion has come back upon us "like a phantasma or a hideous dream."† In the French imitation, no less than the German original, there is a perpetual self-delusion practised by the philosopher, who plays with words as a child with lettered cards, and combines what ought to be the symbols of thought, into expressions unmeaning and self-contradictory.‡ And as in this operation he cannot but be aware that these expressions are the exponents of no conceptions of the intellect, he demands, as the only possible prop of his system, a specific faculty for the absolute, the unconditioned, and—may we not add—the absurd! Thus Fichte asked of all such as would aspire to his primary,

geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Von Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur.—Tübingen, 1835. In this elaborate work of Professor Baur, nearly two hundred pages are devoted to the exhibition of the parallel between the modern seers, and the frantic Ophites and other transcendentalists of the primitive age. Let the reader suspend his judgment until he shall have inquired into the justice of this comparison.

* Hegel gives himself great amusement at the English acceptance of the word Philosophy. He alludes to Lord Brougham's having, in a speech in parliament, spoken of "the *philosophical* principles of free-trade." He attributes a similar expression to Canning; and gives the following as the title of a recent English book, viz. "The Art of Preserving the Hair, on *Philosophical* principles."—*Hegel's Encyclopadie*, pp. 11, 12.

† When we look at the prodigious speculations of the schoolmen, we find expressions highly transcendental. Even Hegel is shorn of his originality, and Pantheism is discovered among the lucubrations of the dark ages. Thus, Johannes Erigena says of the divine nature: "Deus est omne quod vere est; quoniam ipse facit omnia, et fit in omnibus; omne enim quod intelligitur et sentitur, nihil aliud est, nisi non apparentis apparitio, occulti manifestatio, negati affirmatio, etc."—*De Divisione Naturae*, lib. ii. p. 80. Here we have pantheism. Again, "Per nihilum ex quo omnia creata esse scriptura dicit, intelligo ineffabilem et incomprehensibilem divinæ naturæ inaccessibilemque claritatem. omnibus intellectibus sive humanis sive angelicis inaccessibiliter incognitam." Lib. iii. p. 127, apud Rixner, vol. ii. pp. 13—15.

‡ "Little did Leibnitz, Wolf, &c. believe that the language of science would become a witch-jargon (Hexensprache) which we should learn like parrots."—*Herder Metakritik*, ii. 74.

free and creative act of the *Ich* or *Ego*, a certain power called the *Anschauungsvermögen*. It is the want of these optics, alas! which spoils us for philosophers. Reinhold, who often combated, and sometimes rallied his old friend, avowed that he was utterly destitute of this sense, a misfortune, adds M. Degerando, common to him with all the rest of the world.* It is however the happy portion of the absolute Philosophers, the Behmenites, the Gnostics, the Soofies, the Budhists, and a few of the Americans.

It would afford a subject for many more pages than we can allot to this whole discussion, to compare the new philosophy with that of the Oriental mystics. We look with amazement at the exact reproduction of almost every eastern error in the musings of Europe. It should seem that no form of profane absurdity can ever finally die out of the world, until the great suggester of them all shall be cast into hell. Pantheism has by some been regarded as the mother of Polytheism; but mother and daughter have loved to dwell together, and the parent has in many cases survived the child. This form of error prevails widely among the Soofies of Persia, and the Budhists of the remoter east, as well as in countless minor sects in that nursery of

All monstrous, all prodigious things,
Abominable, inutterable, and worse
Than fables yet have feigned, or fear conceived,
Gorgons, and Hydras, and Chimaeras dire.

Two valuable works of Tholuck relate to this subject: the one being a treatise on the Pantheism of Persia,† the other an Anthology of Oriental Mystic Poems.‡ There is scarcely a page of these volumes which does not show something to identify the ancient and eastern with the modern Pantheism. The resemblance is declared by the learned and pious author, who has a decided leaning towards the mystical philosophy. Hegel himself cites this Anthology, with acknowledgment of the same truth, complimenting Tholuck for his genial disposition towards profound philosophy, and at the same time lamenting his still remaining prejudice and narrowness.§ Among these Mo-

* Life of Fichte, by M. Eyriès.

† Ssufismus: sive Theosophia Persarum Pantheistica, etc. Frid. Aug. Deofidus Tholuck. Berolini, 1821.

‡ Blüthensammlung aus der Morgenländischen Mystik, u. s. w. von F. A. G. Tholuck. Berlin, 1825.

§ Encyclopaedie, p. 592, note.

hammedan heretics, the Soofies, we find the declaration that God is every thing; *nihil esse praeter Deum*.^{*} We have also the mental gaze of intuition, the absolute *Anschauung*.[†] We have creation represented as a necessary emanation from the divinity.[‡] We have the absorption of all self in God.[§] We have, ever and anon, the same glorification of nihility, *das Nichts*;|| and, as if no plague-spot of the pestiferous philosophy should be wanting, we have complete Hegelianism in the doctrine that sin is no evil, nay, from one sect of transcendental Persians, that sin is even preferable to holiness.[¶]

Every reader of the common religious news is informed that millions of the Indian and Indo-Chinese people are pantheists. Hegel dwells on this, and quotes the *Bhagavad Gita*, in which Krishna is introduced thus speaking: "I am the breath which dwells in the body of the living; I am the beginning, and the midst of the living, and also their end.—I am, under the stars, the radiant sun, under the lunar signs, the moon," &c. &c. He denies, however, that in this there is proper Pantheism, as he also denies it of his own system.^{**} It would be difficult to deny it of the books of the Vedam. "The school of Vedantam," say the Roman Catholic missionaries in China, "has an authority superior to that of all the others. It professes, as the fundamental principle of its doctrine, the opinion of the simple unity of one existing essence, which is nothing but the *Ego*, or soul. Nothing exists except this *Ego*, in its simple unity; this essence is in some sort *trine*, by its existence, by its infinite light and supreme joy; all is here eternal, immaterial, infinite. But because the inner experience of the *Ego* is not conformed to this beautiful idea, they admit another principle, but purely

* Ssufismus, p. 222.

† Blüthensammlung, p. 116. See also p. 198, where Tholuck says 'Here we have in simple terms the results of the loftiest speculations of modern times. From contrast and comparison the infinite can never be learned.'

‡ Ssufismus, p. 173, ff.

§ Ib. p. 64. "Dixit aliquando Bustami Deo: Quamdiu mi Deus inter Egoitatem et Tuitatem me manere vis, remove Egoitatem et Tuitatem ut Ego nihil fiam." And in the *Blüthensammlung*, Mewlana Dschelaleddin Rumi, a Persian poet "follows (says Tholuck) the pantheistic-mystic view, that all revelations in all religions are alike true, as being different, gradual, evolutions of God," &c. p. 69. So at pp. 87, 88, 89, are exhibitions of the sublimest pantheistic fatalism.

¶ Blüthens. p. 66, note 1.

¶ Blüthensammlung, p. 123, note 1, p. 134, note 1, where Tholuck controverts this absurd doctrine with proper warmth.

** Hegel's Encyk. p. 586.

negative, [das Nichts] and which, consequently, has no reality of being; this is the *Maya* of the *Ego*, that is, *the error*. The key for the deliverance of the soul is in these words, which these false philosophers have to repeat incessantly, with a pride beyond that of Lucifer: *I am the supreme Being*, Aham ava param Brahma.”* We could not ask a more lucid or comprehensive view of the modern German system; for even if the missionaries invented what they say, they have in their invention, anticipated the grandest result of Schelling and Hegel.† And the Luciferian pride, engendered in the Chinese, is precisely the temper which is manifested by those of the Indo-Germanic school who have come to the conclusion that God never arrives at so high a degree of self-consciousness (to use their jargon) as in their own minds. When applied to the doctrines of revealed Christianity, these dogmas produce a portentous mixture. We then learn that the Messiah or God-man is self-developing humanity—the race at large. On this topic many illustrations might be offered; one of these, from a popular poet of genius, we throw into the margin, as neither caring nor daring to translate it: but let him that readeth understand.‡

So far as M. Cousin is concerned, we are ready to concede to him the possession of learning and genius. But his philosophy, as far as he has developed it, is to the last degree superficial and conceited. Making great pretensions to extraordinary profoundness, it does in truth but skim the surface of things, and then fly off into thin and unmeaning abstrac-

* Choix des Lettres édifiantes, Paris, 1809, T. iv. p. 246, ap. Tholuck's *Sufismus*, p. 214.

† We should, perhaps, have said before, that Kant is altogether exempt from the charge of Pantheism, representing God as “not by any means a blind, acting, eternal, *Nature*, the Root of all things, but a supreme Being, who by understanding and freedom is the author of all things.” See Jacobi, u. s. p. 114.

‡ Drum bitt' ich, vor der Hand den Prediger

Auf seinem Berge ungekränkt zu lassen,

Doch dass beschwor' ich, so gewiss das Alte

Der Alten nicht mehr neulebendig wird:

Der Mann, in welchem Gott war—Gott wird leben !—

Der Mann, wer er dereinst zu euch herabsteigt,

Und zweifach, dreifach, millionenfach

Bei euch als Mensch, als alle Menschen lebt:

Er wird nicht dreifach goldne Kronen tragen,

Er wird in's Knopfloch keinen Orden knüpfen,

Er wird der Herr von Bethlehem nicht heissen,

Er wird nicht weibesbaar im Kloster singen, u. s. w.

Laienbrevier von Leopold Schefer. Berlin, 1835.

tions. The "witch jargon" which it employs, when you have taken infinite pains to penetrate it in a given case, is often found to contain only some old truth, swathed and bandaged in this hieroglyphic dress. And one known truth, thus prepared, is then "made use of, to pass off a thousand nothings with." There is not, and in consistency with the first principles of this philosophy, there cannot be, any attempt at ratiocination. It is a string of assumptions, and of assertions of the most unqualified and dogmatic kind. The reader cannot have failed to remark, in the extracts we have given, the peculiar kind of generalization in which M. Cousin habitually indulges. Because England is an island, therefore every thing in England stops short of its proper development, and England can make no valuable contributions to science. Because in religion, God is ever thing and man is nothing, therefore no religious man can be a great man. Thus on all occasions he takes but a single step from the narrowest possible premises, from vague analogies, and sometimes from nothing more solid than verbal puns, to the most wide and peremptory conclusions. A hundred times in passing over his pages, we have been constrained to ask, is this philosophy, or is it poetry? It can surely make no pretensions to the one, and it is but sorry stuff, if meant for the other.

But the philosophical defects of this system, do not constitute its chief point of repulsion. We have a wide charity for what seems to us nonsense, and we can even extend an amiable and silent tolerance to the pretensions of those who utter it, to be the depositories of all wisdom. But when this nonsense begins to ape the German impiety, when it openly professes to cast off all subordination to religion, and prates in dogmatic superiority to divine revelation, we cannot but lift up our solemn protest against it. It has been made sufficiently evident that the philosophy of M. Cousin removes the God of the Bible, and substitutes in His stead, a philosophical abstraction; that it rejects the Scriptures, and thus robs as of our dearest hopes; and that, in common with other like systems, it erects a false standard in morals, and confounds the distinction between right and wrong. We cannot therefore behold in silence the efforts which are making to introduce this system of abominations among us.

It has already made some progress. The Introduction to the History of Philosophy was translated and published in 1832, by M. Linberg. The first edition of the Elements

of Psychology was published in 1834, and having been adopted, as the translator informs us, "as a text-book in several of our most respectable colleges and universities," a new edition is now issued which has been expressly "prepared for the use of colleges." It might be well if the names of these most respectable colleges and universities were made known to the public. We should like to know which of our public seminaries of education has so far distinguished itself in point of science as to take, for its text-book on mental philosophy, an immethodized set of criticisms upon Locke. The work of M. Cousin does not pretend to the order and method of a scientific treatise; it only claims to be a criticism upon the defects and errors of the sensual Philosophy. It formed a part of the author's regular course of lectures upon the History of Philosophy of the 18th century. And has it really come to this pass with any of our most respectable colleges and universities, that they are using fragments of Historical treatises as text-books upon science? Do they also learn the Newtonian Philosophy from Clarke's criticisms upon Rohault's Physics? And is Varignon's reply to Rolle, their text-book upon the Differential Calculus?

But, for more urgent considerations than those of science, is it important that these most respectable colleges and universities should be known to the public. Most of the extracts which we have given from M. Cousin, have been taken from his Introduction to the History of Philosophy, and yet it will be seen that some of the worst of them have been furnished by what Dr. Henry has dignified with the title of Elements of Psychology. And this latter work implicitly contains them all, since it teaches, in their application to criticism upon Locke, the same principles which in other modes of their application, yield the results which we have exhibited. It should be known therefore what college or university dares assume the responsibility of instilling the principles of this book into the minds of the young men committed to its care. Where are these literary institutions that are so ambitious to commence the work of flooding the land with German infidelity and pantheism? If they are willing to undertake the work, they will doubtless, in a measure, succeed. There is something in this new philosophy which will recommend it to many, and especially to young men. It has the charm of novelty. It affects to be very profound. It puts into the mouths of its disciples a peculiar language, and imparts to them a knowledge which none others can at-

tain. It gives them the privilege of despising all others, and makes them incommensurable with any standard of criticism but their own. If pursued and pressed by argument, they have but to rail, as their master does, at "the paltry measure of Locke's philosophy," and ridicule the bounded, insular character of all science except that in which they are adepts. It flatters the pride of the youthful heart, it takes captive the imagination, and, a still more dangerous recommendation, it tends to lighten and remove the restraints of passion. It recognises no standard of right and wrong but the reason of man, and permits no appeal from the decisions of humanity to the authority of the one living and true God. While it retains the name of God, and does not therefore at once startle and shock the feelings like open atheism, it teaches its disciples to deify themselves and nature, and to look upon all phenomena alike, whether of the material universe or of the mind of man, as manifestations of the Deity. Every emotion of the heart is an acting forth of God, and every indulgence of a passion, however depraved, becomes an act of worship.* The man who exercises in any way, according to his inspired impulses, his body or his mind, even though God is not in all his thoughts, is really rendering to Him as acceptable service, as if his heart were filled with emotions of adoration and reverence. The forge of every smithy, as Thomas Carlyle has taught us, is an altar, and the smith, labouring in his vocation, is a priest offering sacrifice to God.

Such being the recommendations of this philosophy, it cannot be doubted that it will find many willing disciples, some attracted by one set of its charms, and some by another. If any of our most respectable colleges have engaged in teaching it, they will not find refractory pupils. But we warn them that when this system shall have worked out, as work it must, its pernicious and loathsome results; when our young men shall have been taught to despise the wisdom of their elders, and renounce the reverence and submission which the human intellect owes to God; when in the pride and vain glory of their hearts, they shall make bold question of the truths which their fathers have held most dear and

* See ample evidence of this base and diabolical tendency of the doctrine of pantheism, in an article in Professor Hengstenberg's Journal for November 1836, entitled, *Bericht über ein pantheistisches Trifolium*. For example, as we have said elsewhere, we learn, that Schefer and his compeers teach "that *sin* is the hither aspect of that which *on the other side* of the heart is entirely laudable."

sacred; when the Holy Bible shall be treated as the mere play ground of antic and impious fancies, and an undisguised pantheism shall spread its poison through our literature; then shall they who have now stepped forth to introduce this philosophy among us, be held to a heavy responsibility. Are these idle fears? They are at least real. We believe, therefore do we speak. And we point the incredulous to the gradations of folly and wickedness, through which this same philosophy has led the German mind. If neither the internal evidence of the system, nor the lights of ancient and modern experience, are sufficient for conviction, we can only appeal to the verdict that time will give. In the mean while every parent and guardian in the land, has an interest in knowing which of our colleges are making experiment of the effects of this philosophy upon the minds of the young men entrusted to their care.*

We have another alarming symptom of its progress among us, in the Address delivered in July last, by the Rev. Ralph Waldo Emerson, before the Senior Class in Divinity, at Harvard University. This Address is before us. We have read it, and we want words with which to express our sense of the nonsense and impiety which pervade it. It is a rhapsody, obviously in imitation of Thomas Carlyle, and possessing as much of the vice of his mannerism as the author could borrow, but without his genius. The interest which it possesses for us arises from its containing the application of the Transcendental Philosophy in the form of instruction to young men, about to go forth as preachers of Christianity. The principles upon which Mr. Emerson proceeds, so far as he states them, are the same with those of M. Cousin. We find the same conception of the Deity as the substratum of all things, the same attributes assigned to the reason, and the same claim of inspiration for every man. But here we

* How the writers of 'Young Germany' regard the religious tendencies of their coevals, may be gathered from the extravagant and wicked writings of Heine. After saying in his '*Allemagne*,' that Pantheism was the ancient faith of the Teutons, and that "man parts not willingly with what has been dear to his fathers," he says (we ask that it may be duly noted), "Germany is at present the fertile soil of Pantheism; that is the religion of all our greatest thinkers, of all our best artists—and *Deism* is already destroyed there in theory. You do not hear it spoken of—but every one knows it. *Pantheism is the public secret of Germany*. We have in fact outgrown Deism." Again, "Deism is a good religion for slaves, for children, for Genevese, for watch-makers."—"Pantheism is the hidden religion of Germany; and this result was well foreseen by those German writers who, fifty years ago, let loose such a storm of fury against Spinoza."—See *Quarterly Review*, Vol. LV. for December, 1835, pp. 7, 8, 12.

have a somewhat more distinct avowal of the results to which these principles lead, in their application to Christianity, than M. Cousin has seen fit to give us. What we had charged upon the system, before reading this pamphlet, as being fairly and logically involved in its premises, we have here found avowed by one of its own advocates. Thus we have said that if the notion which it gives us of God is correct, then he who is concerned in the production of any phenomenon, who employs his agency in any manner, in kindling a fire or uttering a prayer, does thereby manifest the Deity and render to him religious worship. This consequence is frankly avowed and taught by Mr. Emerson. Speaking of the "religious sentiment," he says. "It is a mountain air. It is the embalmer of the world. It is myrrh, and storax, and chlorine, and rosemary. It makes the sky and the hills sublime, and the silent song of the stars is it." And again, he tells us, "Always the seer is a sayer. Somehow his dream is told. Somehow he publishes it with solemn joy. Sometimes, with pencil on canvass, sometimes with chisel on stone; sometimes in towers and aisles of granite, his soul's worship is builded." He even admonishes us that the time is coming when men shall be taught to believe in "the identity of the law of gravitation, with purity of heart." To show that this tree of knowledge resembles that in Eden in one respect, that it has a tempter beside it, we have but to quote at random from Mr. Emerson's Address. "Man is the wonder-worker. He is seen amid miracles. The stationariness of religion: the assumption that the age of inspiration is past, that the Bible is closed; the fear of degrading the character of Jesus by representing him as a man, indicate with sufficient clearness the falsehood of our theology. It is the office of a true teacher to show us that God is, not was: that he speaketh, not spake. The true Christianity—a faith like Christ's in the *infinitude of man*—is lost. None believeth in the soul of man, but only in some man or person old and departed." He complains grievously of this want of faith in the infinitude of the soul; he cries out because "man is ashamed of himself, and skulks and sneaks through the world:" and utters the pathetic plaint, "In how many churches, and by how many prophets, tell me, is man made sensible that he is an infinite soul; that the earth and the heavens are passing into his mind; that he is drinking for ever the soul of God?" Miracles, in the proper sense of the word, are of course discarded. "The very word Mira-

cle, he tells us, as pronounced by Christian churches, gives a false impression. It is Monster; it is not one with the blowing clover and the falling rain." And when Christ spoke of miracles, it was only because he knew "that man's life was a miracle, and all that man doth." Jesus Christ is made the mere symbol of a man who had full faith in the soul, who believed in the infinitude of our nature, and who thus assists in admonishing us "that the gleams which flash across our minds, are not ours, but God's." Any man may now become Christ, for "a true conversion, a true Christ is now, as always, to be made by the reception of beautiful sentiments."* There is not a single truth or sentiment in this whole Address that is borrowed from the Scriptures. And why should there be? Mr. Emerson, and all men, are as truly inspired as the penmen of the sacred volume. Indeed he expressly warns the candidates for the ministry, whom he was addressing, to look only into their own souls for the truth. He has himself succeeded thus in discovering many truths that are not to be found in the Bible; as, for instance, "that the gift of God to the soul is not a vaunting, overpowering, excluding sanctity, but a sweet natural goodness like thine and mine, and that thus invites thine and mine, to be, and to grow." The present mode of interpreting Christianity, even under the form of Unitarianism, he abhors as utterly repugnant to reason, and insufficient for the wants of our nature; he stigmatizes it as a historical traditional Christianity, that has its origin in past revelations, instead of placing its faith in new ones; and "like the zodiac of Denderah, and the astronomical monuments of the Hindoos, it is wholly insulated from any thing now extant in the life and business of the people." He treats Christianity as a Mythos, like the creeds of Pagan Greece and Rome, and does not even pay it sufficient respect under this aspect to be at the trouble of interpreting for us more than a few of the hidden meanings that lie concealed under its allegorical forms. In a word, Mr. Emerson is an infidel and an atheist,

* "Our world," says Lichtenberg, a witty German philosopher, "will yet grow so refined, that it will be just as ridiculous to believe in a God, as now-a-days in *Ghosts*. And then after a while, the world will grow more refined still. And so it will go on, with great rapidity, to the utmost summit of refinement. Having attained the pinnacle, the judgment of the wise will be reversed; knowledge will change itself for the last time. Then—and this will be the end—then shall we believe in *nothing but Ghosts*. We shall ourselves be like God. We shall know that essence or existence is and can be nothing but—a phantom."—*Vermischte Schriften*. B. I. S. 166.

who nevertheless makes use, in the esoteric sense of the new philosophy, of the terms and phrases consecrated to a religious use.* We have at least to thank him, on behalf of those whose eyes might not otherwise have been opened, for giving us so distinct and ample an illustration of the kind of service which M. Cousin professes himself willing to render to Christianity by means of his philosophy. We would call public attention to this Address, as the first fruits of transcendentalism in our country. We hold it up as a warning evidence of the nature of the tree which has produced it.

We know not with what degree of favour Mr. Emerson's rhapsody was received by those to whom it was addressed; but we are pleased to learn that it was offensive to the authorities of the university. Professor Ware has since delivered and published a sermon, containing an earnest and strong defence of the personality of the Deity.† In obvious allusion to Mr. Emerson, he thus expresses his opinion, "Strange as it may seem to Christian ears that have been accustomed to far other expressions of the Divinity, there have been those who maintain this idea; who hold that the principles which govern the universe are the Deity; that power, wisdom, veracity, justice, benevolence, are God, that gravitation, light, electricity, are God." We noticed too, some months since, in one of our public papers, a severe rebuke of Mr. Emerson, which was attributed to another of the Professors of the university.‡ This then cannot be one of "the most respectable colleges and universities," which have adopted the Elements of Psychology as their text-book on mental science.§

* It is within the compass of the transcendental philosophy to accommodate itself to any form of religion, and appropriate its language. Schelling himself, and some of his disciples, who had been educated in the Protestant faith, embraced, it is said, the Romish religion, and formed within its pale, a sort of inner church, whose symbol and watchword was the name of the Virgin Mary. We have shown it among the Ophites, the Soofies, and the Chinese. Mr. Bancroft has with distinctness laid it open in the scheme of early Quakers, (*History*, Vol. II. chap. 16.) and it is now proffered to us by a clergyman of a church, to say the least, as little tinctured with this sort of poison as any in Christendom.

† The Personality of the Deity. A Sermon, preached in the Chapel of Harvard University, September 23, 1838. By Henry Ware, Jr., Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care. Published at the request of the members of the Divinity School. Boston. 1838.

‡ A paragraph has fallen under our eye, while writing this, which informs us that this same Mr. Emerson has received so much encouragement for what are softly called, "his daring and imaginative speculations," from the people of Boston, that he is now engaged in the delivery of a Course of public Lectures upon them.

§ Since the body of this article was completely written, we have received the *Christian Review*, of Boston, in which there is a notice of the system of Cousin.

It is suited to excite a feeling of surprise, not unmingled with sorrow, that a system of philosophy, which in its immediate and natural results is indignantly repudiated by Unitarians, should be urged upon us, with high praise of its merits, by an accredited minister, and a Doctor in Divinity, of the Protestant Episcopal Church. We are willing to believe that he knows not what he is doing; that fascinated by the first charms of the new philosophy, or perchance dazzled by the brilliancy of a correspondence with a Peer of France and the great founder of Eclecticism, he is not able to see the end from the beginning. But this excuse, the only one that we can make for him, increases our apprehension. M. Cousin informs him, in a letter which has been given, in several different forms, to the public, that he "shall watch with the liveliest interest, the progress of philosophy in America," and that in one of the works which he intends yet to publish, he "will endeavour to be useful to America." In the mean time, he says to Dr. Henry, "it is with great pleasure that I see you resolved to establish yourself in the state of New York, where public instruction is so far advanced, but where philosophy is yet so very languishing: it will be *your duty* to re-animate it, to give it a strong impulse." Dr. Henry has taken care to inform the public that he has been honoured with this commission from the great head of the sect; it has been published and re-published until the whole nation have learned that he has been consecrated by no less a personage than M. Cousin, to the duty of re-animating our philosophy. Can he now abandon this work, and leave the duty assigned him to be performed by any meaner hand? We fear not. We fear that if any misgivings should cross his mind, they will give place to assurance with the arrival of the next packet that shall bring a letter and a presentation copy of some new work from M. Cousin, or even at the very thought of such an arrival.

If our augury should prove right, we too will watch his labours. We read the Introduction to the History of Philosophy, and the Elements of Psychology, upon their first appearance, but we kept silence because we did not wish in any degree to draw public attention to them until evidence was afforded that they were read. We now have this evidence, and have felt it our duty to be no longer silent. But, having

We are encouraged by these signs of healthful resistance, and corroborated in our judgment, by finding that the author of this sound and conclusive review, who has evidently seen the monster in its native German forests, recognises its tracks in the attempts of M. Cousin.

done so, we gladly desist from the attempt to trace the pedigree or indicate the family traits of these various systems. Be they Indian, Teutonic, or French, we regard them alike with fear, as if some demon were bent on playing fantastic tricks with poor, proud, purblind man. We pretend not, as we have said, to comprehend these dogmas. We know not what they are: but we know what they are *not*. They are not the truth of God; nay, they gainsay that truth at every step. They are, if any thing can be, profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science *falsely so called*.* So far as received, they rob us of our most cherished hopes, and take away our God. No one who has ever heard such avowals can forget the touching manner in which pious as well as celebrated German scholars have sometimes lamented their still lingering doubts as to the personality of God. But while these systems rob us of our religious faith, they despoil us of our reason. Let those who will rehearse to us the empty babble about reason as a faculty of immediate insight of the infinite; we will trust no faculty which, like eastern princes, mounts the throne over the corpses of its brethren. We cannot sacrifice our understanding. If we are addressed by appeals to consciousness, to intuition, we will try those appeals. If we are addressed by reasoning, we will endeavour to go along with that reasoning. But in what is thus offered, there is no ratiocination;† there is endless assertion, not merely of unproved, but of unreasonable, of contradictory of absurd propositions. And if any, overcome by the *préstitige* of the new philosophy, as transatlantic, or as new, are ready to repeat dogmas which neither they, nor the inventors of them can comprehend, and which approach the dialect of Bedlam, we crave to be exempt from the number, and will contentedly abstain for life from “the high priori road.”‡ The more we have looked at it, the more we have been convinced of its emp-

* The original is pregnant: τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως.

† Bretschneider, though a German, seems to have felt this. “It would be unreasonable,” says he of Schelling, “to demand a *proof* of such a system. For as *to prove*, means but this—to deduce something true, from something else previously known as true, there can here be no such thing as proof from higher principles, since we seek the *first truth* from which all others are deduced.” Bretsch. Grundasicht, p. 7.

‡ Even the Critique of Kant, which was rational and common place when set by the side of our recent philosophy, was by Herder regarded as so extravagant, that in his answer to it, he cites from Swift’s Tale of a Tub, the ninth section, being “A digression concerning the original, the use and improvement of *Madness* in a Commonwealth.” Herder, Vol. ii. p. 223, ff.

tinness and fatuity. It proves nothing; it determines nothing; or where it seems to have results, they are hideous and godless. Moreover, we think we speak the sentiment of a large body of scholars in our country, when we say, that if we must have a transatlantic philosophy, we desire to have it in its native robustness and freshness. We do not wish to have it through the medium of French declaimers, or of the French language, than which no tongue is less fit to convey the endless distinctions of the German. We wish to have it before it has undergone two or three transmutations; not from subalterns but from masters.* We do not wish to have a philosophy already effete, long since refuted, and heartily denounced by the best men in the country of its origin; and above all we do not wish to have a philosophy which shall conduct our young scholars into the high road to Atheism. We learn with pain that among the Unitarians of Boston and its vicinity, there are those who affect to embrace the pantheistic creed. The time may not be far off, when some new Emerson shall preach Pantheism under the banner of a self-styled Calvinism; or when, with formularies as sound as those of Germany, some author among ourselves may, like Dinter, address his reader thus, *O thou Son of God!*† For the tendency of German philosophizing is towards impious temerity. We have long deplored the spread of Socinianism, but there is no form of Socinianism, or of rational Deism, which is not immeasurably to be preferred to the German insanity. In fine, we cleave with more tenacity than ever to the mode of philosophizing which has for several generations prevailed among our British ancestors; and especially to that Oracle in which we read, what the investigation of this subject has impressed on us with double force, that God will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent; that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and that when men change the truth of God into a lie, he will give them over to a reprobate mind.

* 1. *Witch*. Say, if thou'dst rather hear it from our mouths,
Or from our masters.
Macbeth. Call *them*, let me see them.

† Evangelische K. Zeitung, 1836, p. 569.

ART. IV.—*Fragments from the Study of a Pastor.* By Gardiner Spring, *Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the City of New York.* Vol. I. New York: John S. Taylor. 1838. 12mo. pp. 160.

IN taking notice of this little volume, nothing is further from our endeavour than to introduce the author to the attention of our readers; for among many able ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, there are few in our country more widely or more favourably known than Dr. Spring. It is his happiness to have laboured long in one city, and for one church; and this alone, in his case, and a few that are like it, affords a presumption in favour of those who have weathered the storms of the last fifteen years, which have unsettled a thousand pastors. In former times—and we make the remark of our own country—there was something so tender and binding in the pastoral tie, that it was often viewed under the figure of a marriage; and to break it was a matter for long advisement, hesitation, and tears. The aged clergyman could look from the pulpit over a whole generation of whom he had baptized almost every one; whose parents he had not merely addressed but educated, and, by a regular system of instruction that is almost precluded by our present habits, had nourished up in sound doctrine. Who can say how much more mightily the word fell from the lips of one who had walked for many years among its hearers; or how much more reverent was the regard of youth towards the man who had consigned their fathers to the grave with solemn rites; or how much more cordial the counsels to the dying from one whose smile and hand had offered the same paternal aid, for a thousand times! It was good thus to dwell among one's 'own people:' and we shall be slow to believe that any of the boasted advantages of novelty or excitement can ever indemnify for the total absence of these permanent and healthful connexions.

The work of a bishop is a good work; it is, we heartily believe, the best work on earth. No chair of science or literature however conspicuous, no brilliancy of authorship, no vigorous activity in even the best public enterprises, can for a moment be placed in competition with the office of an able minister of Jesus Christ. None are more blind than they who willingly forsake it, whether for the pursuit of

learning and fame, or for the baser covetousness of farms and merchandise. It is a good work, and best of all when it is successfully carried on for years in the same place and among the same hearers. Many a man can make a great impression in a new place, with the few picked discourses of twenty years; or excite a temporary enthusiasm as he itinerates from state to state with a series of his choicest labours. Many a flaming zealot can burn brightly for two years, or even for three, supposing an uncommon supply of oil in his vessel, but to be a burning and shining light in a high place for the best part of a life time, is so far from being an ordinary attainment, that we seriously fear some of our young probationers do not even set it before them as a definite object of pursuit. Preachers as well as people are implicated in the faults which lie at the bottom of this condition of things; but while we would not absolve either the one or the other, we do not feel called upon at this time to trace the unfortunate fact to its real causes. That it is a fact that the term of pastoral connexion is shorter than it used to be, is not, we believe, denied. That this is a great evil, it would be very easy to show. When, therefore, in looking over the churches, our eyes alight on one and another who has been able to maintain his ground, and not only so, but to gather influence every hour, we are irresistibly impelled to say Happy shepherd! happy flock! and to inquire wherein this great strength lieth. It was therefore with much pleasure that we saw this book of fragments announced, as hoping to have some of our inquiries answered.

Dr. Spring has not given many printed sermons to the world, and what he has here offered has nothing of the pulpit about it: but seems, as he says, to be literally small detached portions collected by an occasional employment of those leisure hours and fragments of time which have remained after the more serious duties of the week have been discharged. In surveying the Table of Contents we were at once arrested by the fourth title, namely, the Letter to a Young Clergyman; and it has not disappointed our expectations. It is such a letter as every young clergyman might rejoice to receive at the outset of his race: happy would it have been for many of us if we had adopted its principles in years long past! It is the scope of this Letter to set the preaching of the gospel in its true light; to magnify the preacher's office, and to rescue it from the degradation into which some have in late years sought to sink it, as compared with certain other

ministerial functions. "I know not," says the author, "how you can more magnify the pastoral office, than by exalting, and performing acceptably and profitably, *the appropriate services of the sacred desk*. By far the most important part of your labours will be found in the duties which devolve upon you as a *public teacher*." This, with the argument that follows, commands our assent; and we are glad to see it thus boldly declared from a source which no man can undervalue as incompetent or inexperienced. There is nothing in these sixteen pages which we would not here joyfully insert, but that we respect Mr. Taylor's copyright. Dr. Spring goes on to point out the ordinance of preaching as one of the great peculiarities of Christianity, unknown among the heathen priests and philosophers, and affording to true religion its self-perpetuating power; the heritage of the poor, and the light of the world. What is next said about the indisposition of people to read the best of books is all too true; though it seems not to be sufficiently considered even by our most benevolent and philanthropic book-makers and tract-distributers. There is no sufficient provision made to generate a taste for reading, without which millions of books, however duly scattered, will be but as loaded tables spread before a loathing multitude: on the other hand, there is, and under the Christian dispensation always will be, a taste for hearing. "Even the most intelligent portion of the reading community derive their religious instructions from the sacred desk. Few, very few of them are readers of religious books. Other streams there are; but a well furnished pulpit is the fountain of religious knowledge. I have no doubt that the public instructions of the sanctuary mould the moral intellect and character of men more than any other, and all other causes combined."

"Can this be doubted, if we look at the real state of the case? Think of such men as Edwards, or Witherspoon, or Davies, or Chalmers, having access to some five hundred, or two thousand minds, two or three times in each week;—minds that are broad awake, and perhaps intensely interested! Such a preacher puts a volume of well digested instruction upon subjects the most deeply interesting and important that can be conceived, not into the hands of a solitary individual, or of a family, but simultaneously into the hands of hundreds. He does this one hundred and fifty times a year. Who does not see that if his own mind be taught of God, and laboriously disciplined, and liberally furnished, and if he is faith-

ful to his trust, an immense amount of truth must thus be poured upon the benighted intellect of men, even within the short compass of a very few years? Let such a ministry be widely and densely scattered throughout the land, delivering the truth, *not in the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power*; and how soon would it bloom like Eden and become as the garden of the Lord! Not to a village, a city, or an extended district, would such a ministry confine its influence; but, like the sun, its going forth would be from the end of the heaven, and its circuit would be unto the ends of it; and nothing would be hid from the heat thereof."

There are perhaps some of our readers who will be at once disposed to exclaim, that in all this there is nothing new, and that they have always conceded to the preaching of the gospel this importance. But these very persons, will possibly find, on a more careful reconsideration of the subject and of themselves, that they have been accustomed to set other ministerial performances higher than that of preaching; and, if they happen to have any personal concern in clerical employments, that they have allotted a meager portion of their time to direct preparation for the pulpit. To all such we address the words of our experienced author, believing that, with the discriminations which he premises, they are precisely what are needed by our young preachers.

"In the whole course of your ministrations therefore, let your mind be directed toward that department of labour to which it must always be mainly applied. Aim early, aim constantly to furnish yourself to become a preacher. Every thing you do, or leave undone, should have influence on your usefulness as a preacher. Instruction from the pulpit is to be your great business. It is a part of a minister's duty, which holds the first place, and which may never be yielded to any other. No other contributes so much to his usefulness. Other duties he has. He must visit the sick and the dying. He must bind up the broken hearted in the house of mourning. He must lift his consolatory and warning voice in the land of silence and amid the memorials of the dead. He must be watchful too, how he neglects to cultivate those social affections whose cheerful and benignant influence the piety of the gospel elevates and purifies, and which wind their way into the kindest sympathies of those he serves. But after all, he must remember that his great business is to prepare for the public service of the house of

God. In no other ought he to be, and for no other does he need to be so well furnished. Nothing may interfere with his duty of preparing for the Sabbath. Next to actual immorality and the want of personal religion, there is no such defect in a minister's character as deficiency in his public instructions. I look upon the minister who neglects the wants of the whole body of his people from a false regard to the wants of a single family, or a single individual, as criminally unfaithful to his high and holy trust. Judge ye whether it is the more profitable to discourse instructively, appropriately, tenderly, with a single family, or to discourse instructively, appropriately, tenderly, with the assembled tribes of God's Israel! I would not have you depreciate pastoral visitation. God forbid! But I would have you appreciate the paramount duties of the Sanctuary. A minister should *never* leave the place of study and prayer, except for the performance of duties which do not interfere with his preparations for the pulpit. I have known men who devoted five days in the week to pastoral visitation, and satisfied their consciences with a single day's preparation for the Sabbath. And I have heard their congregations exclaim, *My leanness! my leanness! wo unto me!* And I have seen their once verdant and prolific field of labour becoming like the heath in the desert."

This is not mere argument; it is testimony; and what our author has heard and seen, we have also heard and seen, and that in many places. No differences among congregations can be more marked than such as have this origin. The collected intellect of a whole people is under a perpetual process of elevation, and their capacity for very high attainment in theological science, as well as in spiritual religion, is constantly expanding, when they come several times a week for years together to listen to a man who is devoting his heart and powers to the acquisition of knowledge for them; who studies and thinks for them; who penetrates for them into the darkest, deepest, richest mines of the Bible, and daily brings them things new and old from pregnant veins that are all unknown alike to pastor and flocks of those who are content to nibble at the surface; and when on the other hand the preacher sees, knows, feels at every utterance of the word that he is pouring out his new and precious discoveries in bible-study into the minds of an eagerly attentive people. Such preachers, such hearers there were among one Presbyterian ancestors, as among the Calvinists of the Re-

formed churches generally. Their discourses were unwieldy and formal, often heterogeneous and uncouth; but they were full of matter, full of argument, full of the scriptures. Their gold had not passed under the hammer, their jewels, if uncut, were innumerable and sparkling. They worked for this. There was meaning in the appellation which they so often used,—they were *painful ministers*; their studies were consequently magazines of good things for their hearers, like Hezekiah's 'treasuries for silver and for gold, and for precious stones, and for spices, and for shields, and for all manner of precious jewels.' And when our diminutive theologians complain of the high discourse, and, as to them it seems, overladen argumentation, and abstruse inquiry of Howe, Baxter, Bates, Owen, Flavel, and the like, let them remember that they preached to congregations who had grown up under just such discipline, who had never lived on a milk-diet since their spiritual nonage, and who felt in their masculine health that strong meat *belongeth* to them that are of full age, even those who *by reason of use* have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. Such use they had, carrying their bibles to church, verifying every citation; and the pulpit-men of that day were not cautious of multiplying texts, as if these would spoil the ambitious rounding of a sentence or lest the *callida junctura* of a paragraph should be broken in upon by the words of the Spirit. These sermons were sometimes rough, but they were full; each of them was, as Hall said of Foster, 'a lumbering wagon of gold:' and they were so because the preacher *sought* to find out acceptable words, ('words of delight'), and that which was written was upright, even words of truth. They did not expect, that after a week spent in lounging, or in gay company, or in mere human science or elegant letters, or in the farm, or the nursery, or the stock-market, or the shambles, they should by special inspiration be enabled to give their people what God or they could approve. They could not in conscience rely on mouldy skeletons of ancient sermons, brought out from the charnel house of the drawer or barrel, as bones that are 'very dry;' nor yet on the extemporaneous gush of a voluble tongue pouring out thoughts which took longer to deliver than they had taken to conceive. No: their opinion was like that expressed by good old John Norton of Boston, who used to say in his diary, *Leve desiderium ad studendum; forsân peccato admisso*; or that of Charnock, who replied to the importunity of his friends, "It cost Christ his life to

save, and what if it cost me *my* life to study for him?" Or of Thomas Shepard, another father among the pilgrims, who in still stronger terms declared: "God will curse that man's labours, that lumbers up and down the world all the week, and then upon Saturday in the afternoon, goes to his closet; when, as God knows, that time were little enough to pray in, and weep in, and get his heart into a fit frame for the duties of the approaching Sabbath." From the instructions of such men the Reformed churches gained a strength which even the palsy of our modern day has not been able wholly to destroy; and when we find young preachers summoned to something like the old preparation for conflict, by one who knows the weight of the armour, it stirs up our souls within us like the sound of the trumpet.

Dr. Spring avows the hesitation with which he enters upon the delicate task of suggesting the best methods of preparation for the pulpit. None but a very ignorant or a very self-sufficient man could dream of enjoining his own plans to every one. Indeed, as no really able preacher sermonizes exactly like any body else, so no two methods of preparation can be exactly alike, except among pitiable imitators. The individuality and subjective character of a man must let itself out, before he can ever do any thing great: he must be himself. And therefore we shall never think of wasting argument upon the race of dictators, who maintain that every sermon must be written out in full, or on the other hand that no sermon should be written out in full; until we alight on one of them who shall preach as ably and successfully as Whitefield and Hall who never wrote, or as Edwards and Davies who wrote always; and as silently shall we listen to all prescriptions that discourses should have no declared partition, or that each shall have just as many 'heads' as Cerberus. For talents differ, modes of thought, feeling and elocution differ, auditories differ, and therefore preparation will differ. But preparation of some sort, and that stated, laborious, life-long preparation, there must be; and we are grateful to Dr. Spring for the hints he gives, which are applicable in their spirit to all the diversities of preliminary labour; these hints are far too good to be omitted.

"The youthful ministry are very apt to be determined in their selection of subjects by their own resources; whereas a rigid determination, so far as is possible, to furnish *appropriate* instruction, while it would necessarily augment their resources, would commend them to every man's conscience

in the sight of God. I need not tell you that a preacher needs a *Common Place Book*, as much as an antiquary, or a statesman; and that the more it is enriched, the more certainly will he give variety and richness, as well as tenderness and power, to his illustrations of God's truth. I am confident that I have been the loser by inattention to this article until comparatively a late period in my ministry. You will of course also have your *Text Book*, where you will note down from time to time such subjects for sermons as strike you, and where you will make references to such valuable thoughts as may fall in your way in the course of your general reading and reflection. If I mistake not, you may find the following hint of some service. In your daily and careful study of the Scriptures, you will find now and then favoured hours, when light shines upon the sacred page; when your heart burns within you; when your mind is active, and almost every paragraph and clause suggest a topic and a method for a sermon. I have found it important to make the most of such seasons, even by turning aside from my projected labours and employing several hours together in sketching plans for future discourses. The fruit when ripe must not only be shaken from the tree, but stored away with care for future use, otherwise it will wither and become unsavoury. Do not trust to memory to retrace these thoughts, but commit them to writing, so that without labour you can call them up when you need them. Such skeletons will always come to good service; and when well elaborated, will rarely disappoint your first vivid impressions. I have known ministers who were perpetually complaining for want of subjects for their public discourses; but I cannot but think that you will rarely be at a loss for subjects, if you are habitually and prayerfully familiar with *the Bible*; but rather will your Text Book be always rich, and far in advance of your necessities. *We* become exhausted without much difficulty; *the Bible* never.

“If you *write* your sermons, which I strongly recommend, never allow yourself to prepare more than one written discourse a week. One sermon a week, well planned, well digested, carefully written, and faithfully applied, is labour enough for any man who allows himself any time for intellectual improvement. One such sermon a week will enable you to draw upon your Text Book for two or three others without much preparation. In your most laboured discourses, let the force of your mind and the ardour of your heart be

laid out in the application of your subject. Ministers often fail in this, and it is a sad failure. In a word, make every discourse as good as you can make it. Sure I am, my dear brother, that if you are like the writer of this letter, you will find defects enough in your best performances to fill you with discouragement."

On one of these sentences it would be easy, as it might be useful, to say more; it is a golden aphorism: *WE become exhausted*—the BIBLE, *never*. Here we have indicated the genuine source not only of richness but of variety. We may pardon and pity the preachers of a soulless "creed outworn," whose ministers are flying from preaching to politics, and whose whole system is a grand negation of fundamental truth, when they tell us, as does the Rev. Orville Dewey, that the pulpit wants variety, and that "it is made dull by the restriction and reiteration of its topics."* We do not think any orthodox Bible-student will ask a wider range of subjects than the scriptural body of evangelical doctrine. Our most lively, interesting, and never-tiring sermonizers are those whose discourses are most biblical; while the most jejune and self-repeating are such as fly from the investigation of the sacred text, in its trains of argument, and infinite flow of history. Instead of a Common Place Book of Heads in Theology, we would open before every man the Bible as his Common Place Book: his series will then be large enough. "He who preaches upon *subjects in divinity* (we now quote Bishop M'Irvine), instead of passages of Scripture, fitting a text to his theme, instead of extracting his theme from his text, will soon find that, in the ordinary frequency of parochial ministrations, he has gone the round, and traced all the great highways of his field, and what to do next, without repeating his course, or changing his whole mode of proceeding, he will be at a great loss to discover. Distinct *objects* in the preacher's message, like the letters in his alphabet, are few—few when it is considered that his life is to be occupied in exhibiting them. But their combinations, like those of the letters of the alphabet, are innumerable. Few are the distinct classes of objects which make up the beautiful landscapes under the light and shadows of a summer's day. The naturalist, who describes by *genera* and *species*, may soon enumerate them. But boundless is the variety of aspects in which they appear under all their diversities of shape, co-

* Moral Views of Commerce, &c. By Orville Dewey. Preface.

lour, relation, magnitude, as the observer changes place, and sun and cloud change the light. The painter must paint for ever to exhibit all. So as to the great truths to which the preacher must give himself for life. Their variety of combinations, as exhibited in the Bible, is endless. He who treats them with strict reference to all the diversities of shape, proportion, incident, relation, circumstance, under which the pen of inspiration has left them, changing his point of observation with the changing positions and wants of his hearers, allowing the lights and shadows of Providence to lend their rightful influence in varying the aspect and applications of the truth—such a preacher, if his heart be fully in his work, can never lack variety, so far as it is proper for one who is to ‘know nothing among men but Jesus Christ and him crucified.’ He will constantly feel as if he had only begun the work given him to do—furnished only a few specimens out of a rich and inexhaustible cabinet of gems.”

This is an admirable illustration of the truth which we have quoted from the work before us; a suggestion, we may observe as we pass, strikingly exemplified in the discourses of Melvill, recently presented to the American public by Bishop M’Ilvaine, whose further remarks we shall here subjoin :

“Melvill is strictly a preacher upon *texts*, instead of *subjects*; upon truths, as expressed and connected in the Bible, instead of topics, as insulated or classified, according to the ways of man’s wisdom. This is precisely as it should be. The preacher is not called to deliver *dissertations* upon questions of theology, or *orations* upon specific themes of duty and spiritual interest, but expositions of divine truth as that is presented in the infinitely diversified combinations, and incidental allocations of the Scriptures. His work is simply that of making, through the blessing of God, the Holy Scriptures ‘profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness.’ This he is to seek by endeavouring ‘rightly to *divide* the word of truth.’ Too much, by far, has the preaching of these days departed from this expository character. The praise of *invention* is too much coveted. The simplicity of interpretation and application is too much undervalued. We must be content to take the bread as the Lord has created it, and perform the humble office of *distribution*, going round amidst the multitude, and giving to all as each may need, believing that he who provided it will see that there be enough and to spare, instead of

desiring to stand in the place of the Master, and improve by our wisdom the simple elements, '*the five barley loaves*,' which he alone can make sufficient 'among so many.'"

Such concurrence of writers and preachers in different branches of the church, as it regards both principle and practice, augurs well, and gives promise of returning vitality in American sermons. It is but a few years since we were in all the din and consternation of the new-measures; during this the pulpit was neglected, except when in the so-called "protracted-meeting" it was employed, not to instruct but to electrify, and when the serious exposition of scripture was sacrificed to a strain of scriptural objurgation and ill-bred menace, which was called pungent, close, and to the conscience. During this agitation, the regular stated instructions of God's house, such we mean as admit of being kept up with a healthful glow for years, and the deliberate education of the church in the full course of biblical knowledge which is the true end of the pastoral office, and which can be secured only by men mighty in the scriptures, and meditating in them day and night, were undervalued and set aside, in favour of a kind of harangue which needed no preparation, and which aimed at 'breaking down' the sinner as it was significantly termed. This whole bubble has burst. The leaders in this mighty revolution have slunk into corners, and those good and unstable or ambitious and mistaking men, whether preachers or professors or presidents, who were high in the praise of the Reverend Professor Finney or the Reverend President Mahan, are too happy to have the whole thing forgotten, and to have no inquiry made respecting the time and place at which they sorrowfully turned back from that hurried multitude which has since gone on to Perfection. This inundation has passed and receded, we hope for ever, but it has left its slime; and not only some of its canting phrases, but some of its opinions abide, and must be purged away. Do we not still hear many speak of *pastoral labour* as if the only proper labour of the pastor were his dealing with individuals or with families? Is there not still a craving for those paroxysms which to both preacher and people were an excuse for retiring from calm and spiritual labouring in God's holy truth? Is there not a readiness in many to believe that the old way of Christianity is an obsolete way, and that the spirit of the age requires high stimulation instead of never-ending instruction? Where these things may be affirmed with truth, there is much to be unlearned. We must honour

God's institution, and especially abide by his word, or we shall be liable, at the very next rise of the tide, to be swept away.

Let us say distinctly, we set a high value upon parochial visitation, and upon all proper instruction and advice to individuals. But by this we mean veritable religious visits by the pastor or elders of the church; such visits as Kidderminster received from Richard Baxter; but not the hasty calls of a clergyman, to gossip, hat in hand, on the weather and the news, or the more serious and protracted interviews of the clerical tradesman or politician in which hours are sacrificed to party or to avarice. And even of visits strictly religious, we are persuaded the demand of large congregations can never be satisfied; and the attempt to satisfy them is a yoke and a snare to many a conscientious servant of Christ. The shepherd should know his flock; he should be familiarly acquainted, if possible, with every individual of his hearers: but if he were to act out some of the principles which we have seen laid down by imprudent men, he would never have an hour with his books, and after all would fail to go through his routine to the satisfaction of himself or the parish. Those who complain most of the want of attention from their pastor, are often the very persons who are most disconcerted when he comes, and to whom pointed religious conversation is least welcome. No congregation should therefore complain of their minister, when they know him to be studying the Scriptures for their sakes, and when they are assured that his absence from their homes is not occasioned by any secular labours or amusements.

We have left ourselves no more space for the other articles of this volume, than to say, that they are remarkable for the characteristic traits of the author, seriousness, good sense, tenderness, and polish. The *Church in the Wilderness* is a felicitous apologue; and the smaller papers are attractive and edifying. As this is marked as the first of a series, we hope to greet similar productions again and again.

ART. V.—*General History of Civilization in Europe, from the fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution.* Translated from the French of M. Guizot, Professor of History to La Faculté des Lettres of Paris, and Minister of Public Instruction. First American, from the second London edition. New York: D. Appleton & Co. pp. 346.

THE new series of leading events which began with the birth of civilization in modern Europe seems destined to extend its widening progression to the end of time. All the preceding states of society are now seen to have been intrinsically defective, even in the rare cases of rapid and brilliant development; and if now the more civilized nations of the world have taken broader and firmer ground as the basis of their social order, a comparison of their present position with that of the primitive societies of Europe, may give them at once a pleasing sense of security and a joyful hope for their advancement.

The chief value of history lies in its faithful representations of the progress of human improvement. The great facts in the annals of the world are the pregnant indications of a progressive intellectual and moral movement, under a wise and righteous superintendence; and it is reading history with eyes that see not, to overlook the significance of the world's vicissitudes, and suffer the thoughts to adhere in the rigid surface of a bare narration. We feel a lively interest in directing the attention of our readers to the history of Europe as an illustration of the progress of the human mind. Although the subject in its general aspect is not new, yet at successive periods, it comes before us with new associations, and is adapted to produce new and useful impressions.

We return, therefore, our cordial thanks to Professor Guizot for his Lectures on the History of Civilization in modern Europe, and to the translator for giving them to the English reader. Whatever may be their imagined adaptation to meet a particular crisis in either Europe or America, they are full of instructive illustrations of the great principles on which real and permanent social order must, in any country and in any age depend. We contemplate, with satisfaction, the state of society, and the course of public thought which have given being to such a book. The appearance of this

work is an interesting social phenomenon. To say nothing of the inherent importance of the subject, or the internal excellence of the work, we regard the publication as the index of an advanced state of society. The very act of surveying the past with the eye of philosophy, implies a readiness if not an ability to draw gratifying comparisons between the past and the present. There is an evident propensity in the intellect of the present century, to test the purity and stability of the existing social systems of the world, and to appreciate their superiority over those of earlier date and briefer duration. It is a favorable omen. The progress of human society has furnished invaluable records of experience to instruct the present and all coming generations; and when these records are explored, and their contents digested and given to the world with the ability displayed in the work before us, we are prepared to anticipate inestimable good to the interests of mankind. Let the friends of humanity consult rather the dictates of a sound philosophy than their preference for favourite theories, let them reason, reflect and act, in their social relations, with the history of the social systems of the world before them, and their course will be attended with less noise, perhaps, and less display, but with more substantial prosperity, and brighter and surer prospects.

An intense desire to draw the attention of our readers to this book of M. Guizot, or to some such views of European history as he presents, has led us to consult that object in the preparation of this article. The work itself is a series of Lectures delivered by M. Guizot, in his capacity of a Professor of the Faculty of Letters, at Paris, and appear to constitute an introduction to a more extended course. We propose to ourselves the pleasing task of placing before our readers, in a condensed view, the outline of this animated, philosophical, and instructive History; presuming it will prove a more acceptable service to the public, than a discursive review of the work, with the selection of a few literal and isolated extracts.

The civilization of the different states of Europe is sufficiently uniform to permit its being collected under one distinctive head as European, and too various to be presented in the history of any single state. Civilization is one of the great moral facts pertaining to the history of the world; the great fact in which all others merge, and in which they find their importance. Hence, we judge of minor facts as they affect this greater one, and even overlook and forgive the

evils of some of the heaviest calamities of nations, if they have but aided the progress of civilization.

The common idea of civilization comprises two elements; the progress of society and the progress of individuals in improvements; the amelioration of the social system, and the development of the faculties of man. We should not recognise our common notion of civilization among a people enjoying only a satisfactory regulation of physical existence, while the moral and intellectual energies are repressed; where the people, like so many flocks of sheep, are carefully tended, but destitute of moral and intellectual activity; nor do we find it in many of the countries of Asia, where the people have less physical comfort, while the deficiency may perhaps be compensated by a stinted allowance of mental light, from which every sentiment of personal liberty is excluded; nor is that civilization which consists in the widest range of personal liberty, where disorder and violence reign, where might makes right, and the weak are oppressed by the strong—a condition of human existence, which once prevailed in Europe; nor, finally, do we discern it in the fullest extent of liberty, and a free acknowledgment of social equality, while there exists no general interest; where the people entertain few public ideas; where men live isolated, with little regard for society, and scarce a sentiment of its influence. No one of these states corresponds with our general idea of civilization. There must be advancement; a progressive development of human nature; improvement of the social system, and improvement in the condition and character of individual man.

The first step in our course will be, to seek out the elements of European civilization at the time of its birth, the fall of the Roman empire. We will then put these elements in motion, and follow their progress through the fifteen centuries which have since rolled away.

Before entering on the history of the civilization of Europe, let us notice one feature by which it is distinguished from all the instances of civilization which preceded it. Take any case of civilization antecedent to that of Europe, and we find it possessed by a single ruling principle. Each case seems to have emanated from a single idea. In Egypt and India the ruling principle was theocracy; in the commercial republics of Asia Minor and Syria, in Ionia, and Phoenicia, the ruling principle was democracy. There were frequent struggles, indeed, between different principles which sought

to prevail; but the war always terminated in the ascendancy of one, which then took sole possession of society, and imparted its hue and form to all the social institutions. This predominance of single distinct principles gave each instance of civilization a peculiar character, and led to different results. In Greece, the unity of the social principle produced a development of wonderful rapidity. The course was brilliant and short. Greece lived fast through her glory. The principle of her civilization seemed exhausted by its own development. In India and Egypt, by the prevalence of a different principle, society became stationary, monotonous, and torpid. The intellectual productions, also, of the different civilized nations, bear the character of unity which distinguished their civilization. The monuments of Hindoo literature, lately introduced into Europe, were all struck from the same die. Religious and moral treatises, history, poetry, all bear the same physiognomy. And even the literature and the arts of Greece were pervaded by this same remarkable unity.

But turn to modern Europe, and all the principles of social organization are found existing and acting together. Powers temporal, powers spiritual; theocracy, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy; infinite gradations of liberty, wealth, and influence, are here jumbled together, in continual struggle among themselves; no one being able to master the others, and take sole possession of society. You see the same variety of moral character and of sentiments. Opinions of all imaginable sorts crossing and limiting and modifying each other; the advocates of one extreme checked and restrained by the advocates of the opposite; an indomitable thirst for independence dwelling side by side with the greatest aptness for submission, a singular fidelity between man and man, with an imperious preference in each man for his own way. In literature and the arts how vast the diversity. Particular departments may not have reached the same perfection with the products of ancient civilization; but if Europe has not brought any single fruit to so high perfection, she has ripened an infinitely greater variety. Compare too, her long continued progression; not indeed with Grecian rapidity, but with far more than Grecian constancy and perseverance; having advanced for fifteen centuries, and still advancing, with a boundless career before her.

Here it is that European civilization reveals at once its distinctive character, and its immense superiority. It is a

civilization for the world; where various powers and principles incessantly intermingle and contend. It has cast off the special character; penetrated into the scheme of the universal providence, and prepared itself for general propagation among the nations of the earth.

This characteristic of European civilization can be discerned in its very cradle; at the moment of its birth, when the Roman empire fell. For what was the Roman empire? A mere assemblage of municipal institutions. Nations then were only confederations of cities. There was no country population, but slaves, or mere labourers. Rome extended her power in Europe, by conquering or founding cities. Hence Rome could conquer the world more easily than govern it; and an empire was attempted, which should bind the scattered society together. Between the reigns of Augustus and Dioclesian, the improvement of civil legislation arranged throughout the empire a chain work of subordinate functionaries, which knit the people to the imperial court, conveyed abroad the will of the government, and brought in the tribute and obeisance of the people. The incoherent assemblage of little republics, thus held together, acquired a sudden attachment to the central power, and sank rapidly into obedient respect for the sacred name of emperor; but in the fourth century, all these bonds were as suddenly broken; the provinces severally yielded to barbarian invasion, and no longer indulged concern for the common destiny. This crisis suggested the extraordinary idea of a representative system, as an instrument of reviving the patriotic sentiment, and preserving the unity of the empire. The call for a representative assembly of the provinces in the south of Gaul, was made by Honorius and the younger Theodosius in the year 418, but it received no response. The primitive nature of the society was opposed to it; the municipal principle everywhere re-appeared. The Roman empire had been formed of cities, and to cities it again returned.

There were then bequeathed to Europe by the ancient Roman civilization, these two elements of social organization: the municipality, and the empire; the idea of the city corporation, and the idea of imperial power. In intimate conjunction with these, came also another most important element, which had grown in the heart of Roman society; the *Christian Church*, with its independent government, its priesthood, its polity, and its revenues. It is not the Christian religion that is here intended, but the Christian

Church; an ecclesiastical institution, to be contemplated in a political view, in its relation to civilization. At first, a simple association of believers for the exercise and enjoyment of a common faith, with no formal creed, no settled rules of discipline, no body of magistrates; then, assuming a form of doctrine, rules of discipline, and a body of magistrates, still leaving the power in the general body of believers; then, thirdly, separating its clergy from the people, and making an uncontrolled and irresponsible government over the private members of the church. Here were trained men of great strength and zeal, who stood ready to catch the civil authority as it fell from the hands of the expiring municipalities, and who did, without being guilty of usurpation, and by the common law of nature, become gradually invested with immense temporal power and responsibility.

From this point we date the powerful co-operation of the church in the cause of European civilization. The church arose to exercise a moral power at a time when the world would else have fallen under mere brute force. She also, at that period, undertook the separation of temporal and spiritual authority, and revealed the true basis of the strictest and most extensive liberty of conscience; and thus, in the fifth century of her existence, conferred great benefit upon the cause of humanity. Would that she had not subsequently transcended that modest and useful sphere.

These three elements of Roman civilization, are now to be contemplated in that combination with barbarian principles, in which they dropped into European society, in the cradle of modern civilization. In the true picture of a barbarian, you perceive the pleasure of personal independence; of enterprise and adventure; degenerate, indeed, and developed as a gross passionate desire, in connexion with a brutal and stupid selfishness, and yet denoting some of the nobler elements of moral character. It was the pride of personal liberty, not the sentiment of political liberty; and therefore unknown to Roman society, and brought into European civilization by the rude barbarians of Germany. You perceive the features of the warrior; the foundation of a firm fidelity between man and man, and of a graduated subordination which grew into the aristocratic organization of the feudal system.

We have, then, before us, the three sources from which the elements of our society were derived; municipal society, the last remains of the Roman empire; Christian society; and

barbarian society. We find the love of the most absolute independence by the side of the most devoted submission; military patronage, with ecclesiastical domination; spiritual power and temporal power every where together; the canons of the church, the learned legislation of Rome, the almost unwritten customs of the barbarians; a co-existence of nations, of language, of manners, of ideas, of impressions, in endless diversity. What wonder that the progress of European society has been so slow and troublesome!

These elements of civilization thus combined and set in motion, we are to follow in their progress; and we enter first the dark age—the age of barbarism. Here we are met on the threshold with a simultaneous advancement of claims to the exclusive possession of power, and the agitation of the great question of political legitimacy. Theocracy, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy, and even the church; each, would found claims of precedence first on justice and right, then on antiquity, and hence the idea of legitimacy is not attached to monarchy alone, but appertains to all the elements of European society. From this simultaneous advancement of claims by all the principles, we conclude that, during the period of barbarism, Europe was under the sole dominion of no one of them. The dispute respecting which bore chief sway, proves that all existed together, while none so prevailed as to give society either its form or its name.

We find at this period four classes of persons: 1st, Freemen, who depended on no superior; 2nd, *Landes*, *Fideles*, *Antonstions*, &c. who were first connected with each other as companion and chief, afterwards as vassal and lord; 3rd, Freedmen; 4th, Slaves. These classes were not stationary, as to the persons who composed them; but individuals were constantly passing from one rank to the other. Property was also held in various ways. Institutions were unstable. Monarchy, aristocracy, and free institutions, all existed, but were subject to constant change. States also were created and suppressed, united and divided, and a confusion of principles, governments, nations, languages, formed the chief characteristic of barbarian Europe.

The period of barbarism closed with the termination of the invasion; at which time, the progress of civilization was hastened on by the natural aspirations of the people, the remembrance of Roman civilization, the Christian church, and the appearance of great men. These various causes led to several attempts of social organization: 1st, An attempt by

the barbarians themselves, in reducing their rude laws to writing; 2d, In Italy and the south of Gaul, there was a slight resuscitation of municipal order; 3d, In Spain the church undertook the work of civilization, and until the great invasion of the Saracens, her efforts were great and successful; in France, Charlemagne was the great promoter of civilization, and in England, Alfred the Great. But all these causes, however promising, were unsuccessful in putting an end to the period of barbarism, and establishing a general social organization. When the northern invasions had ceased, society gradually became more settled and secure. In the south, the Arabs had settled in Spain, and were still contending with the Christians; the Saracens still infested the coasts of the Mediterranean, but the career of Islamism was arrested. Meantime in the interior of Europe, the wandering life declines, populations become fixed, estates and landed possessions become settled; local attachments and little societies begin to be formed; on one hand, we see the proprietor settling in his domains, on the other, the subordination of services and rights pertaining to a military organization; and thus we perceive the feudal system oozing at last out of the bosom of barbarism.

Wherever barbarism ceased, feudalism prevailed; proving that, in the tenth century, the feudal system was the only social system practicable. Every institution—the church, the free community, royalty, accommodated itself to this new order of things. Churches became sovereigns and vassals, cities became lords and vassals, royalty was hidden under the feudal suzerain. Not that the feudal principle so universally prevailed; it was only the feudal form, under which the different social institutions respectively exercised their own principles. The church retained its theocracy, the free cities clung to their democracy, royalty to its monarchy; and all strove to free themselves from that system whose livery they were compelled to put on. But every thing became feudal in its aspect.

Under this system, as a great physical cause, Europe underwent an important change. The conquerors of the territory, once settled in cities, or moving in bands, were distributed at long distances apart, each isolated in his particular domain; carrying the government of society from the cities to the country, and splitting the public body into a thousand little sovereignties. The possessor of a fief plants himself in his castle, in the midst of his household, who are

now to be his companions; where at once begin to rise into importance the domestic relations, and especially the social character of woman. At the foot of the castle hill, stands a huddle of cottages, inhabited by the serfs, the cultivators of the feudal domain. Here religion has planted a church and a priest. Thus the Baron, the people of his domain and the priest, present us with the original outline of the feudal society.

The feudal family had its characteristics, which distinguished it from all other family systems, and which produced a social development peculiar to itself. The patriarch lived with his children and his servants, had the same occupations, led the same life. The head of the Scottish or Irish clan, separated himself from his servants, and while they were employed in supplying his wants, he lived in idleness, or in war. Yet their common parentage, their common remembrances and associations, created a moral tie, and a feeling of equality between the head and all the members of the clan. Not so the feudal family. The proprietor and his family are separate from the rest of the population, lead not the same life, claim not the same origin. The family is small, forming no tribe, but consisting of only the possessor of the fief, his wife and his children, linked together by domestic affections, and prepared to form, in the progress of their improvement, the domestic character and manners, and to give to the feudal possession a permanent identity by means of the principle of inheritance.

The lord of the domain considers the serfs as his property, indulging towards them, perhaps, those kindly feelings which the relation permits, yet not yielding to them, as men, either rights, guarantee, or society. Hence of all the despotisms which the world has known, the feudal despotism is the only one that has been the object of invincible and invariable hatred to the common people. It tyrannized over the destinies of men, without ruling in their hearts. The religious element of feudalism was no alleviation; the priest could do little to affect the mutual relation or conduct of lord and servant, being himself an inferior and under the sovereign control of the baron. The serfs were not known in any general society. Beyond the fief which sustained them they had no relations, no concern, either with persons, or government. They were no part of a nation, had no common country, no common destiny. But the possessors of fiefs held relations

to each other, and the attempt was made to build on these relations a body of general laws and institutions; in other words, to organize the feudal system. But there was no predominant will, to which the independent barons would submit; there was no united will of individuals to constitute a public power, and the laws had therefore no guarantee, and of course no stability.

Feudalism, therefore, while it produced elevated feelings and character in individual minds, accomplished little in favour of general society. It seemed indispensable as a step from barbarism; but was, in itself, radically vicious, and could neither regulate nor enlarge society. It permitted no substitution of public authority for private will; a substitution which is the chief element of social order. It produced an offspring of noble sentiments, of splendid achievement, of beautiful forms of humanity, but it every where opposed the establishment of social order, and the spread of general liberty.

The influence of the church upon modern civilization has been more powerful, perhaps, than her most violent adversaries, or most zealous defenders have supposed. It was the only institution which, in the fifth century, possessed youth and vigour. All others had the weakness of either infancy or old age. The church existed as an ecclesiastical corporation, a government of religion. It derived an immense force from its respect for equality, and the various kinds of legitimate superiority. It was the most popular society of the time, the most accessible; the only one which opened its arms to all the talents, to all the noble ambition of man. It was, indeed, her great error that she denied the rights of individual reason, and assumed the right of compulsion; that she undertook to govern human thought and opinions. Yet this error notwithstanding, where was there ever a society in which reason and conscience more boldly developed themselves than in the church? Witness her sects, her heresies, the fruit of individual opinions; the proof of the life and moral activity which reigned within her.

When the church erected herself amid the ruins of the Roman empire, and found herself surrounded by barbarian kings, between whom and herself there existed no connexion of interest, she felt herself in danger; and it became her policy to attach these barbarians to her interest. To accomplish this, she increased at once, and largely, the number of her imposing ceremonies, and surrounded herself with great pomp and splendour, to dazzle their senses, and excite their

imagination. And still further to preserve herself against barbarian violence, she announced anew and with increased emphasis, her principle of separation between temporal and spiritual power; and by the aid of this principle, she dwelt freely among those who felt little interest in her welfare.

From this desire for liberty, it was but a step to the desire of power. From independence she aspired to authority. Finding herself in possession of all the intelligence of the age, at the head of all intellectual activity, she very naturally would assume the general government of the world. Add to this, the miserable state of temporal government, at that epoch, when its power was mere brute force, and its moving spring a rapacious ambition; when the interpositions of spiritual authority in temporal affairs were often salutary and welcome to the oppressed and injured people, and seemed like the offices of heavenly pity intended for the refuge of the defenceless;—and we perceive ample cause for the success of the usurpations of the church. She always laboured, however, under this great disadvantage, of having no physical power of her own, and of being obliged to call in the aid of the secular arm, and borrow the civil power to enforce her own authority. Unfortunately also for the church she persisted in completing the separation between the governing and the governed. The independence of the clergy was in process of time fully established. The laity had no other concern with the government of the church than as mere lookers on. The people had, indeed, an influence upon the government, but no legal concern with it; and out of this circumstance arose many of the evils which have cost the church so dear. The clergy and the laity were however bound together by the general dispersion of the clergy through the social system. From the thatched cottage of the husbandman,—from the miserable hut of the serf at the foot of the feudal chateau, to the palace of the monarch—there was everywhere a clergyman. The bishops, also, were mixed up with the feudal system, members, at the same time, of the civil and ecclesiastical government; and by these means a degree of sympathy was ever maintained between the clergy and the laity, while the legal separation of the two classes was complete.

The influence of the church on individual character and manners was confined chiefly to the bosom of her own society. For the instruction of the clergy she was anxiously alive. She excited and kept alive a general activity of mind by the

offer of her dignities to select individuals; but beyond this she did little for the mental improvement of the laity.

To the social state her influence was more beneficial. The great vices of the social world, particularly slavery, she perseveringly opposed. She laboured worthily for the improvement of civil and criminal legislation; preserving and defending those mild and rational ideas of justice which had been derived from Roman society, as well as those which she derived from her own code of divine morals. The system of penance, so far as the application of moral law was concerned, accorded with those notions of modern philosophy which make repentance and example the ends of punishment. And her steadfast opposition to the practices of violence and war, was calculated to ameliorate the social system by an infusion of gentleness and conciliation.

An immense influence has, then, been exerted on the moral and intellectual order of Europe by the Christian church. The progress of Europe has been essentially theological. Down to the time of Bacon and Descartes, theology was the blood in the veins of the European world. It possessed and directed the human mind; every idea bore its stamp; every question of philosophy, politics, history, was considered in relation to it; and even the mathematical and physical sciences were compelled to submit to its doctrines. Bacon in England, and Descartes in France, were the first who carried the human mind out of the pale of theology. The influence of the church thus kept up the salutary intellectual movement in Europe, and stamped upon that movement its own superior impress. It gave unprecedented extent and variety to the mental development of the world. The intelligence of the east was altogether religious. In Greece there was nothing religious. In Europe religious intelligence is mingled with all other knowledge; and thus the two great sources of human development, humanity and religion, have been open at the same time, and flowed in plenteous streams.

While we admit that the church has exerted a salutary influence on the moral and intellectual character of man, and largely contributed to ameliorate the social condition, we cannot deny that in a purely political view, her influence has been baneful. Her political spirit was either the spirit of theocracy or of imperial tyranny. In her weakness she sheltered herself under absolute power in the empire; in her strength she laid claim to that power herself; and whenever

a question arose between power and liberty, the church always took the part of despotism.

Look now at the several states of the church from the fifth century to the twelfth. First, she appears the church imperial. Just as the Roman empire fell, the church believed that she had conquered paganism and heresy; and thus attained the summit of her hopes. But she found herself among new pagans and new heretics; among Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, and Franks. The fall was great. She tried to re-establish the empire, and besought the barbarian kings to become emperors, and take the same relation to the church which had been taken by the Roman emperors. The struggle was in vain; and the church, like the civil world, sank into the arms of barbarism. This was her second state; and in this period came a new separation of the temporal power from the spiritual, that the church might again assume her independence; and there came also the establishment of monasteries, where religious men could defend themselves by peculiar sanctity against barbarian spoliations. Her next state was her connexion with the feudal system, divided and weakened, and dispersed among the independent fiefs, and struggling to keep herself together by some federating principle, yet without success. She lost her order and harmony, and even her moral character. In the eleventh century she entered upon her fourth state, that of a theocracy supported by monastic institutions. In this period the holy see was raised to the summit of its power, and strenuous efforts were made to reform the abuses which were prevailing in the church. Important advances were also made towards the attainment of intellectual liberty. A serious struggle occurred between the clergy and the advocates of free inquiry. This was the nature of the strife between Abelard and St. Bernard; and it was the great event of the twelfth century.

About this time, corporate cities begin to make a figure in history. Their previous existence indeed merits attention, but it was not till the eleventh or twelfth century that they performed any important part in the world, in connexion with modern civilization. Between the fifth and tenth century, the towns were neither in a state of servitude nor freedom. They suffered all the evils to which weakness is liable; they were a prey to the continual depredations of the strong; yet impoverished as they were they maintained a certain degree of importance. There was commonly a bishop, whose presence gave a sanctity to their independence; and there

were some valuable fragments of Roman institutions. But all seemed to decline. The bishops having incorporated themselves into the feudal frame, thought less of their municipal life, and the rising importance of agriculture drew the people out of the cities into the country; and thus from the fifth century to the time of the complete organization of the feudal system, the cities languished. Then they began to resume activity and importance. When society had become settled under the feudal system, the proprietors of fiefs began to feel new wants, and acquire some taste for improvement, and for the benefits of commerce and industry in the towns of their domains. The cities also afforded a refuge to fugitives from oppressive powers, and thus acquired accessions to their population in some instances, of high character and rank. They gradually grew, therefore, in strength, in wealth, and in the importance of their interests, and about the beginning of the eleventh century, broke forth in rebellion against the lordly and overbearing proprietors of fiefs. Each town arises in open resistance against its lord, and commences an enterprise against the neighbouring castle. The towns become confederate for the common benefit, and by united resistance are able to sustain a protracted struggle, till at length, both parties incline to peace; and Europe, particularly France, which had, for a whole century, abounded in insurrections, now abounded in treaties of peace and charters. As the royal power was frequently called upon to interfere in the quarrel, there arose a close connexion between the citizens and the king. By the enfranchisement of the cities a new general class of society was produced, the merchants, and little land or house proprietors of the cities. These were the elements of the present class of European citizens.

Then came the struggle between the different classes of population; and this struggle, perpetual and universal, is the grand characteristic of European civilization. In Asia, one class has completely triumphed, and the conflict of classes has resulted in the system of castes; and society has there become entirely stationary. In Europe, no class, thank God, has ever yet conquered and subjugated the others; and the continual conflict of ideas, interests, and manners, is an unquestionable source of the activity and the progressive development of European society.

We have now arrived at the crisis when the monarchical principle began to be decidedly developed. Until nearly

the twelfth century, the civilization of Europe was in a process of formation; then succeeded a period of attempts, and experiments, during which the different elements of society approach and combine, and prepare to act together, a period extending to the sixteenth century; after which came the period, in which human society in Europe takes a definite form, and proceeds with a rapid and general movement towards a clear and precise end; this is the period which began in the sixteenth century and is now pursuing its course.

The second of these periods is the one on which we now enter. The great event of this period was the crusades; an event which wrought an important change in the condition of nations.

They were universal; all Europe concurred in them. They were the first European event. In relation to each separate nation, they were a national event. All classes of society yielded to the same impulse, and the moral unity of nations was now for the first time made manifest.

There were two great causes which impelled Europe to the crusades, the *first* was moral, the impulse of religious feeling and belief. These enterprises were the continuation, and the height of the great conflict of Christianity with Mohammedanism. The *second* cause was social. The lapse of time, after the organization of society, discovered that the limits of human enterprise were too narrow; that the thoughts and energies of men aspired beyond their contracted sphere; and the people threw themselves into the crusades, as into a new state of existence, in which they had more space, and more variety. At the end of the thirteenth century these causes ceased to exist; and the crusades consequently came to an end; leaving, however, a new and distinct aspect upon the condition of the human mind. We observe an immense advance towards enlarged and liberal ideas. The crusaders became travellers. They observed different nations, different manners; and their minds were disengaged from their old and narrow prejudices. They saw in both Greek and Mussulman society, something superior to their own degree of civilization, and were struck with the riches and elegance they beheld on every side. They collected a vast amount of information, much of which was useful, and returned to their families, full of the remembrance of incidents, marvellous and often exaggerated by their own imaginations, yet expanding, by their natural tendency, the range of thought and interest. Religious doctrines

underwent no essential change; but thought had become more free, and religious creeds were not the only subjects which exercised the mind. The social state was partially revolutionized, by the necessity under which the feudal proprietors fell, of selling their fiefs to the kings, to raise money for the crusades. Property and power fell into fewer hands, and feudal power began to exist on a larger scale. The extension of great fiefs, and the consequent dependance of the smaller fiefs upon them for protection, were important results of the crusades in reference to feudalism. And as to the towns, the crusades created great civic communities, and gave to maritime commerce the greatest impulse it had yet received.

The European mind had now expanded beyond the exclusive dominion of the few contracted religious ideas, which had moved to the crusades; and the progress of the social relations had furnished a greater variety to life in Europe, and removed the necessity of going abroad for mere entertainment. Now kings began to see the road to political aggrandizement. The people saw the road to wealth open before them, and gave up foreign adventures to engage in industry. The feudal nobility only, not being disposed to industry, retained their former manners, and endeavoured to renew the crusades. All things seemed now to wear a new aspect as the effect of these remarkable movements. On the one hand we observe the emancipation of thought, on the other a general enlargement of the social sphere; more individual freedom, and more political unity. Society was drawn from a narrow road to follow broader paths, and European society assumed the form of *governments and nations*, the grand characteristic of modern civilization.

We are now to contemplate the connexion of monarchy with the progress of human society in Europe. When society had seemed to complete its organization, and government and people were the only objects of historical interest, the settled form of government in all the great European states was that of monarchy. It is a significant fact that we find monarchy holding the most prominent place, and the most general and permanent of all institutions, the one most difficult to preclude where it does not exist, and where it does exist, the most difficult to extirpate. It has penetrated every where and accommodated itself to all situations.

In surveying the effects of monarchy in modern Europe

we are not considering the effects of the individual will of a sovereign. We take monarchy as the personification of legitimate sovereignty; of the collective wisdom and will of the people. That there is a legitimate sovereignty, is the doctrine of every people; for they have always endeavoured to place themselves under its empire. Human nature must believe in legitimate sovereignty. All political philosophy labours to discover it. Theocracy, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy, all boast of having found the seat of legitimate sovereignty, and promise to place society under the authority of its rightful master.

European monarchy has been in some sort, the result of all the possible kinds of monarchy. The barbarian monarchy was essentially elective. The rulers were military chiefs, whose power was accepted by many of their companions; and who were obeyed as being the bravest and most competent to rule. As the families from which the monarchs were selected grew powerful, the election was more confined to them, until the course of things gradually gave rise to the idea of hereditary succession. Meanwhile, religion spread its sanctity over the origin of the ascendant family, and suggested the doctrine that kings were descendants of the Gods, and the proper objects of religious veneration. The monarchy of the Roman empire was the personification of the state; the emperor was the representative of the whole republic; as, in France, the sovereignty of the people was transferred to Napoleon; and the people, represented in him, were the real monarch. After three centuries of these monarchies had passed away, the principle began to assume a religious form, and the monarch began to be regarded as a representative, or delegate of God. These three kinds of monarchy, the barbarian, the imperial, the religious, made their appearance, in the fifth century, on the ruins of the Roman empire, and proceeded in their different courses.

In France, under the first race, barbarian monarchy, with some mixture of inheritance and of religious notions, remained predominant. In Italy, the imperial monarchy prevailed. In Spain, the monarchy was more religious. In England, it was essentially barbarian. In the eighth century, the principle began to assume a more uniform character; its varieties were more blended together, and especially did there enter into the composition a stronger infusion of the religious character. In the reign of Louis le Debonnaire the king fell into

the hands of the clergy, and a monarchy subordinate to religious authority was on the point of being established. Through the tenth and eleventh centuries the prevalence of the feudal system produced a fourth kind of monarchy, of the feudal stamp in which the king became in theory a *suzerain* over *suzerains*, a lord of lords. But in the twelfth century, the institution of monarchy began to assume the character of a great magistracy, whose office was to maintain peace in society, to protect the weak, and decide differences which could not otherwise be settled. Here originated the vital principle of modern monarchy. At different periods of history we observe the reappearance of all the varieties, each in its turn striving for the ascendancy; and while the clergy preached a religious monarchy, and the civilians contended for the imperial, and the nobility for the elective, or the feudal system, monarchy itself made them all contribute towards the advancement of its own power; and at last reduced all the elements of society to two:—the government and the nation.

All attempts to bring the various portions of society together without destroying their diversity failed. The attempts were very numerous and occupied the space of time during which the metamorphosis of European society was accomplished. Too many of them arose from selfishness and tyranny, yet some were pure and disinterested. They were of two kinds; one intended to exalt to supreme rule one of the social elements, and making all the others subordinate to it; the other proposing to unite them all, ensuring to each its due share of influence.

The first was, the attempt at theocratic organization; the effort of the clergy to obtain the government of Europe. It proceeded naturally from the political and moral superiority of the church. But it was met by a series of obstacles which it could never overcome. One was the nature of Christianity, a system of moral influence only. Of course the church, however great its moral influence, could not obtain the political power. Another obstacle was the feudal nobility, who would never give way to the power of the church. A third was the celibacy of the clergy which rendered the church dependent on the laity, for the perpetuity of its own existence; and the fourth, the greatest of all, was the divisions and disputes of the ecclesiastical world itself. The national churches of most of the European states quarrelled with the Roman court; the councils, with the popes;

heresy, schism, dissension, disturbed the peace and destroyed the unity of the ecclesiastical body. These obstacles, however, did not prevent a vigorous and protracted effort; till in the reign of Gregory the seventh, the pompous proclamation of the designs of the church awoke a general and irresistible reaction, first, in the people, then in the sovereigns. At the end of the thirteenth century, the church gave up the project of temporal dominion, and thence forward acted only on the defensive.

The second attempt was that of a republican organization. The free cities of Italy had grown more vigorously than those of any other state in Europe. The barbarian nobles became extensively residents in the cities; the conquerors and the conquered were mixed together within the same walls. The Italian towns acquired in this way an immense and precocious superiority; while the towns of other states remained poor, insignificant communities. This is the reason why the republican organization was so successful in this part of Europe. In the Italian republics, however, with all their brilliancy and energy and wealth, there was no security of life; there was no progress of institutions; and to this day, the best of Italian patriots regret the success of republican organization in their country in the middle age. If this attempt thus failed in Italy, much more elsewhere. The democratic organization attempted by the Albigenses in the south of France was resisted by the feudal interest of the north. Among the Swiss it succeeded better a little later. In the north of France, it triumphed in the internal government of cities, but was confined to them. The feudal nobility terrified and jealous formed coalitions to arrest the progress of republican principles, and after a long and wearisome struggle, there appeared a very general disposition for mutual concession, and an attempt at mixed organization. We now see coming forth upon the history of Europe, the States-general of France, the Cortes of Spain and Portugal, the Parliament of England and the States of Germany; all assemblies in which the nobility, the clergy, and the cities or commons, met and laboured to unite themselves into one sole society.

The first was an indifferent affair, resorted to by all parties from a feeling of necessity, regarded with interest by none. It was indirectly useful to France, in keeping alive the remembrance and the claims of liberty, but it never became a means of government, and never answered its original design.

The Cortes of Spain and Portugal came to the same general result, and like the states-general have been a mere accident in history; never a system of government.

England experienced a different fortune. There were no great vassals sufficiently powerful to maintain a contest with the crown. The high aristocracy were forced to unite for common defence, while the minor proprietors of fiefs were brought with the burgher class, into the House of Commons, composing a body capable of influencing the government of the country. Thus the effort to unite the various elements of society into one body politic succeeded in England, while it failed in every part of the continent.

In Germany, the attempts at a mixed organization, though undertaken, were coldly followed up, and the various elements have remained more distinct in Germany to the present day. Here feudal interest appears in the election of royalty; ecclesiastical sovereigns were continued, and free cities were preserved with a true political existence and sovereignty.

All these efforts then failed, except in England. Society was not yet sufficiently advanced to adapt itself to unity. Political ideas were not yet truly public. It was necessary that an active and powerful civilization should assimilate the incoherent ingredients of society, and that a public authority and a public opinion should be created. We are now approaching the period when this great consummation was effected. It was in the sixteenth century that modern society really commenced.

It is the characteristic of the fifteenth century that it constantly tended to create general interest and general ideas; to produce what had not till then existed on a large scale, nations and governments. This process was begun in the fifteenth century, but carried out in the two centuries next following.

Let us glance at the political and moral facts of the fifteenth century. In France, the last half of the fourteenth century and the first half of the fifteenth were occupied in great national wars with England, for the independence of her territory and her name. Thus the nationality of France began to be formed. The history of the French as a nation began with the princes of the house of Valois; when, for the first time, the nobility, the citizens, the peasants were united by the tie of a common cause and a common honour. At the same time also did France enlarge, fix and consoli-

date her territory. Then, too, began a unity of government. Taxation, administration of justice, military force, became parts of one great system, and the feudal powers were superseded by the power of the state.

In Spain, we observe movements simultaneous and similar. By the conquest of Grenada, in the fifteenth century, the conflict between the Christians and the Moors was brought to an end; the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella united the two kingdoms of Castile and Arragon under one dominion, and Spain was consolidated into one kingdom. The monarchy was extended and confirmed. It had indeed, the inquisition instead of a parliament; an institution which though, at last, employed in defence of religious faith, was at first erected for the support of civil order.

Germany also came forward in her order. In the middle of the fifteenth century, the house of Austria came to the empire; the election thence forward became a mere sanction of hereditary right, and unprecedented permanence was given to imperial power.

The fifteenth century in England was occupied in war with France abroad, and between the two houses of York and Lancaster at home. At the end of these struggles, the English nobility were diminished in wealth, number and power; the Tudors ascended the throne, and with Henry VII. began the era of political unity in England.

Italy reared no monarchy, but, in the fifteenth century, she reduced her republicanism and extinguished its spirit; and foreign sovereigns asserted dominion over the different parts of the peninsula.

The change we are now contemplating was every way momentous. The old elements of society every where disappeared. There was something deeply melancholy in the process. In France, in Germany, above all, in Italy, the patriots of the fifteenth century resisted the revolution with ardour, and lamented it with despair; denouncing as despotism, and that justly, what they saw rising every where around them. It was, however, inevitable—it was useful. The old forms were hopeless as means of security and progress to society, and the social destiny of human nature demanded that the primitive system of Europe should fall.

In this century of political wonders, the moral phenomena were scarcely less imposing. The church awoke to a pervading energy in ecclesiastical reform; the people awoke with equal energy to a religious reform; and an intellectual

revolution gave birth to a quenchless ardour of devotion to literature and the arts. It was the period of physical activity; of voyages, travels, enterprises, discoveries, and inventions, hitherto unparalled in their extent and their results. The Portuguese now made their expeditions along the coast of Africa, De Gama discovered the new passage to India by the cape of Good Hope, Columbus discovered America, and European commerce was vastly and suddenly extended. In this century gunpowder changed the system of war; the compass, the system of navigation. Painting and engraving were cultivated and filled Europe with masterpieces of art. Paper made of linen became common, and finally printing was invented, the art of arts, the subject of so many eulogies, which no eulogies however can sufficiently praise. It is impossible to form an adequate idea of the greatness of this fifteenth century, in its relation to the civilization of the world.

Descending now to the sixteenth century, we come at once upon the reformation; the great revolution of the world. The causes to which this event has been attributed are, on the one hand, accidents and mischances, such as the sale of indulgences being committed to one order of monks, which thus excited the jealousy of the others; or, on the other hand, a pure desire of reforming the abuses of the church. But, in a larger view, there was a general cause to which all others were subordinate. The reformation was a vast struggle of the human mind for freedom; a great endeavour to emancipate human reason; an insurrection of mind against absolute power. The labours of the mind in religion and philosophy had been long accumulating; and the time was now come when they must have a result. More men were educated, and educated men wished more to think for themselves. At last came the revival of the literature and the arts of antiquity; and all these causes aroused the intellect of this period to an invincible purpose of going forward. The spiritual power, on the other hand, was imbecile and stationary; sufficiently indulgent, far from being unusually tyrannical; its indulgence favoured the boldness of its subjects, and its weakness tempted their attacks, till, at a providential juncture, the open and eventful conflict began.

Wherever the force of this religious revolution was felt, whether it achieved its full and immediate object or not, its general result was an immense progress in mental activity and freedom. The very reproaches cast upon this event

prove the fact here asserted; the multiplicity of sects, the excessive license of thought and speculation, show that the mind of man felt and enjoyed its emancipation.

This rising spirit of free and independent thought, having shaken off the bonds of ecclesiastical oppression, came at once into conflict with the temporal powers. The first shock occurred in England, where the right of free inquiry, and the desire for general liberty, had been most fondly cherished, and where, at the same time, the power of monarchy was most systematic and overbearing. The leading fact of the English revolution—the struggle between the spirit of free inquiry and pure monarchy—was sure to be repeated in France, and such was the event, when this spirit arose in the eighteenth century against what remained of the government of Louis XIV.

The last two lectures of our author are devoted to a philosophical description of the English and the French revolutions; the first of the two to that of England, the other to that of France.

Our readers will not need to be reminded of the imperfection with which so vast a subject must be represented in so small a compass. If the view given above of the course pursued in the book of M. Guizot, shall recommend the work, and particularly the general subject of it, to the careful attention of any of our fellow citizens, our object in this article will be mainly accomplished.

The believer in Christianity must contemplate the part taken by the church in the cause of civilization with a mixture of satisfaction and mortification. That the church should lead the van of the world, in the career of intellectual as well as moral improvement, was the natural result of her moral constitution. That she should be found with the most perfect organization, amid a general chaos of the social elements, was to be expected from the operation of her divine economy. She was officially concerned with all the great questions which engage the attention of the human mind. Her intellectual activity and vigour, and the rules of her order and discipline, brought her into constant intercourse with the principles of social organization, and gave her, in this respect, an advantage over all other conditions of human society. Nor need we wonder that her influence upon the cause of civilization was so great. She had all the means of influence within her reach. The educated intellect of the world was within her pale. She had constant access to the sources of

moral power. The greatest interests of men were committed to her charge, and her sanctity and divine authority became objects of veneration. No other institution, in the infancy of society, could have a power, for good or for evil, like that which was held by the church. Her superior influence was the natural ascendancy of truth; and with all the weakness and deformity of great corruption, she still proved herself comparatively mighty in the greatest affairs of mankind.

But we look with grief on those pages of her history which show that her heaven-descended laws which were ordained to life, became the instruments and occasions of death. It is mortifying to be told by a cool and candid philosopher that at any period of the world, the church exerted a baneful influence on human society; that she so far forgot her office, and abandoned her province, as rather to retard than accelerate the progress of human improvement, even in political affairs. That this were ever the fact, would be deplorable, and next to be regretted would be the plausible occasions afforded by her history for preferring the charge, even though that charge should be found upon examination to be groundless. It is undeniable that the church transcended, in the middle age, the proper sphere of a religious institution; that her example, as the light of the world, was not only defective, but pernicious; that her course tended to propagate false views of both the faith and the practice of Christianity; that, in this respect, she exerted a baleful influence on the interests of mankind. But as to the relative political evil of her influence, a hasty judgment would be very liable to be unjust. It must be estimated with a careful regard to the state of society around her. The struggles for liberty against which she is charged with having taken her stand, where in many cases such as, under any government, would be resisted by the friends of order, and dreaded as the eruptions of anarchy.

We presume that no citizens of our republican country can read this work of M. Guizot, moderate as it really is, and impartial as it claims to be, without feeling their own principles courteously and gently, yet firmly assailed. The whole work is, by implication, an insidious argument for monarchy; not, indeed, for an absolute, despotic monarchy; but a neutral and powerless form; a shadow, an attenuated abstraction of monarchy, perched on the apex of a popular government, to meet the innate craving of mankind for legitimate sovereignty. We are thankful for his philosophical

suggestions even on this point. We allow his opinions, and honour them, though we may not adopt them. There is however an ambiguity about certain of his speculations on the notion of legitimacy which betrays either diffidence in his assumed positions, or a conscious necessity of adapting his definitions of legitimate sovereignty to the actual state of society in this country. The old doctrines of legitimacy require modification to adapt them to the views of a people who never received them into their political creed. And we cannot but notice the apparent efforts of this writer to expand his construction of legitimacy, in order to cover the idea of a prosperous republic, which his definition must of necessity embrace. Such evidence of the influence of our social system on the theories of an intelligent advocate of monarchy is both gratifying and instructive; proving that the eye of the most discerning philosophy sees more of promise than of discouragement in the progress of our civil institutions.

The American partakers of European civilization are so solemnly concerned in the question relating to the proper elements of permanent social order, that the simplest rules of political wisdom recommend a careful application of all such discussions to our own constitution. It would betray no want of a rational firmness, or of a settled and conscientious preference for our national institutions, to hold ourselves respectfully open to the hints which such a writer so modestly offers for our benefit. As a disinterested philosopher, in the application of his principles to our case, he doubtless would coolly remind us, that the ascendant principle of our social order was brought from the midst of European society in times of a peculiar character; that the spirit which animated the fugitive May-Flower, in her voyage to plant the germ of this nation by the rock of Plymouth, was evolved from the effervescent compound of social elements, then in temporary agitation in Great Britain; the excess of one of the constituents of the mass, after the natural solvent had been saturated; that, unable to subject the monarchical and aristocratical ingredients of English society to its own control, or to neutralize their opposition to itself, it sought escape from their power; and was separated from the mixture, by the joint impulse of a forcible ejection, and its inherent volatility; that the necessity of its expulsion lay in the same principle which must prevent its quiet residence in any of the fixed states of society, and which will introduce, wherever it governs, a pervading contingency into the progress of civiliza-

tion; that it left behind the proportion of mingled elements, to which the progress of social improvement has, for fifteen centuries, been tending, and at which it has now taken its final stand, the only proportion in which the elements of society have ever yet been permanently combined; nay, that it was itself expelled, that this proportion might be preserved.

He would, then, perhaps, proceed to suggest the inquiry, whether, in the form of our social organization, we are not attempting to repeat the frail and shallow simplicity of the old world. In England, he would say, where alone the identity of civil institutions has survived a protracted advance of civilization, and where it seems likely yet long to survive, the great principles of society are wonderfully blended. Theocracy, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy, all find a response to their respective claims in the nature of man. The history of the world asserts this truth; and hence, the perfection of the social organization may yet be found in the skilful combination and mutual adjustment of these great elements in the constitution of society. Now the principle of social order in the United States, is but one of the several elements combined in European society; and therefore the same narrow basis, from which the societies of the old world have, for centuries, been tumbling, is the only basis of those popular institutions.

Should we meet him with our favourite argument from success and unrivalled prosperity, he would turn our argument against ourselves. He would admonish us that this rapid development is the very proof of our imperfection. The portentous precocity of states, like that of individuals, is matter of history and of general observation. Greece was a wonder during her brief day; but where now is Greece? The single principle of our social organization will now, as it did then, produce a rapid and surprising evolution of some of the properties of human nature; but these productions will soon fade and fall, like false blossoms from boughs which live on the single material for luxuriant bloom, without the elements of rich and durable fruit.

Such suggestions we understand to be legitimate inferences from the statements and reasonings of our author. We disclaim, for our country, any peculiar or pressing necessity for such admonitions as he indirectly offers; yet the exceeding plausibility of his hints is calculated to awaken a salutary caution among the firmest believers in republican doctrine. From the degree of freedom which would suit all the friends of a popular government, it is but a step to political licen-

tiousness. Liberty may degenerate into lawlessness. The love of freedom is not always distinguished from aversion to moral restraint. The vicious propensities of our prosperous republic are now unquestionably under strong excitement, and if it be true that they have not the requisite checks in the spirit of our constitution, the final results of our political experiment will soon be known. May our country profit by the seasonable admonitions of history, and not spurn, to her future sorrow, the counsels of the dark and troublesome, but instructive ages of the world.

We are encouraged to believe that nations are becoming more thoroughly established in the principles of peace. The advance of civilization in each nation must necessarily produce improvement in the laws of its intercourse with other nations. Whatever tends to the perfection of society at home, must promote a proper deportment abroad. International civilities will increase in their value and popularity, as society in the different nations becomes completely organized, and enjoys quiet and prosperity. We consider every step of advancement from barbarism a step of approximation towards the ascendancy of reason and justice over brute force; and towards the destruction of the absurd practice of war for the settlement of national disputes. The practice of suspending individual claims of justice on the event of a battle was among the first to fall before the power of civilization, and the kindred practice of war, either to ascertain or to procure justice between nations, must fall in its turn. We are so sanguine as to believe that, notwithstanding all the recent warlike manifestations, it would be now difficult to involve any two of the most civilized nations of the world in war with each other. It seems to us cheeringly evident that the leading nations of the civilized world were never before so fully prepared to entertain sentiments of peace, as at this moment. The solemn dissuasives from expensive, bloody and demoralizing warfare, may now be urged with the hope of unprecedented success; and the friends of civilization may derive from this fact the most substantial encouragement in relation to the future progress of their cause. War may once have contributed to the improvement of society. But the state of society which war would improve must be at the lowest extreme of barbarism. The civilized nations have risen above the elevating influence of military discipline, and are prepared to practice and enjoy the higher and more refining arts of peace.

If our hopes in this matter are not entirely groundless, we cannot easily exaggerate the promise which the present state of the world affords, of the future progress of civilization. The prevalence of universal peace will give fair opportunity for the resources of the nations to fall into permanent channels of intellectual and moral improvement. These channels will grow deep and broad, and the waters which fill them will grow active and pure. The religion of the Bible which has been the leading instrument in bringing the world to this stage of advancement, will impart fresh impulses of increasing power, to which the human mind will be better prepared to yield. Nations will be as emulous of moral excellence and moral power as they now are of commercial and intellectual importance, and the world will speedily recognise the predicted reign of peace and light and love.

We are most agreeably indebted to the French minister of instruction, for the variety of interesting reflections which his *History of European civilization* has awakened in our minds. We esteem his views on most of his subjects worthy of the high station he holds. We deem it creditable to France that she sustains in one of her high offices, and honours with her confidence, a man of so genuine public spirit, and so lofty and magnanimous principles as M. Guizot. We admire the elevation from which he surveys the world, and the dignified, philosophical calmness of his speculations on the most confused and violent revolutions in human affairs; and we take peculiar pleasure in inserting at the close of this article, a paragraph from one of his pages, not less honourable to his views of philosophy than to his respect for a doctrine of theology.

“It is thus that man advances in the execution of a plan which he has not conceived, and of which he is not even aware. He is the free and intelligent artificer of a work which is not his own. He does not perceive or comprehend it, till it manifests itself by external appearances and real results; and even then he comprehends it very incompletely. It is through his means however, and by the development of his intelligence and freedom, that it is accomplished. Conceive a great machine, the design of which is centered in a single mind, though its various parts are entrusted to different workmen, separated from, and strangers to each other. No one of them understands the work as a whole, nor the general result which he concurs in producing; but every one executes, with intelligence and freedom, by rational and vol-

untary acts, the particular task assigned to him. It is thus that, by the hand of man, the designs of Providence are wrought out in the government of the world. It is thus that the two great facts, which are apparent in the history of civilization, come to co-exist; on the one hand, those portions of it which may be considered as fated, or which happen without the control of human knowledge or will; on the other hand, the part played in it by the freedom and intelligence of man, and what he contributes to it by means of his own judgment or will." p. 257.

QUARTERLY LIST

OF

NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

A Grammatical Analysis of Selections from the Hebrew Scriptures, with an exercise in Hebrew Composition. By Isaac Nordheimer, Doctor in Philosophy, &c. &c. 8vo. pp. xii and 148.

This volume is a companion to the author's Hebrew Grammar, and, as a specimen of printing, still more beautiful. Its use is, not to supersede the study of the grammar, but to point out the right method of pursuing it. By carefully referring to the rules here cited, the learner will, on finishing the course, have mastered the substance of the grammar, learning each thing as he wants it, and that not abstractedly, but in connexion with the study of the text. He will then be prepared for a full and systematic perusal of the grammar in detail, which, if undertaken earlier, would only serve to puzzle and disgust him. The omission of the Hebrew text not only saves much room, but accustoms the student to the complex notation of the Masoretic Bibles. The author has availed himself of this opportunity to rectify some inadvertent errors in the Grammar, as well as to anticipate some portions of the syntax, which is not yet published. The least valuable part of the Analysis consists in the translations, which, if never incorrect, are often infelicitous, and in a majority of instances, superfluous. Many of the idioms which are thus explained, are perfectly familiar to our students through the literal versions of the English Bible. Another fault is the unnecessary repetition of the same references after the reader must be perfectly familiar with the rule referred to. As an instance, we may mention the extraordinary frequency with which the use of shurek with the vav conjunctive is explained, at length, or by a reference to the grammar. Even

after the learner has reached the extracts from Hosea, in the last sheet of the volume, he is still referred to § 684. 3. *a*. It is obvious, however, that both these faults have arisen, not from negligence, but from an extreme anxiety to do the subject justice. The only other feature of the work which seems objectionable is the selection of the passages explained, especially in Genesis and the Minor Prophets. The creation and the flood were certainly entitled to the preference; but instead of the scraps which follow, we should have been glad to see the history of Joseph, or some other uninterrupted context, such as the book of Ruth. Beauty of style and interest of matter are better grounds of choice in Germany than here, where every man who learns the language of his own accord, has read the whole of the Old Testament in English, and expects to read the whole of it in Hebrew. We know too by experience and observation, that, to students, few things are less interesting than mere scrapes or fragments. The selections from Isaiah and the Psalms are made with judgment. After this explicit statement of the few faults which we find in the Analysis, we cheerfully pronounce it far superior, in plan and execution, to any other work of the same kind within our knowledge. We would especially commend it to the notice of clergymen and other men in active life, who wish to recover what they once knew of Hebrew, and extend their knowledge, in accordance with the system of the new grammarian. A careful study of this book will make them well acquainted with the essential parts of the best Hebrew Grammar in the English language.

Comprehensive Commentary.

Since our notice of this work in a previous number, we have seen what purports to be a corrected impression of the last volume. We learn by a letter from one of the publishers that the editor has, in some cases, expunged notes which were deemed objectionable; and in others, has so guarded them "that they will not be likely to be misunderstood." On a slight examination of this revised copy, we were glad to see that the more prominent phrenological articles, which were justly considered one of the greatest objections to the work, have been removed. We were also gratified to perceive that some of the doctrinal notes to which objection had been taken, (for example those from Wetstein and Macknight on Rom. 3: 25, 26) had been left out, while others have been partially modified. We greatly regret, however, that the editor has not judged it best to expunge entirely all the notes which are not in harmony with the views of the authors whose commentaries form the basis of the work. He seems to have thought it sufficient to guard against any evil from this source, to add references to other portions of the work where correct views are inculcated.

The truth of the matter as we understand it is just this. Dr. Jenks has given as far as we know, the principal portions of the commentaries which he undertook to abridge, but he committed the great error in judgment, as we must regard it, of inserting here and there a note containing views not only opposed to those of Henry and Scott, but which, as we hope and believe, he himself seriously disapproves of. To a considerable extent this error has been corrected in the revised copy.

We should infer from the manner in which the work has been spoken of in some of the religious papers, that the impression prevails that the objectionable notes are much more numerous than they really are. We looked through the fifth volume as first printed, and did not notice more than fifteen or twenty which we considered seriously objectionable; of these the phrenological portion, as already stated, appear to have been, in general expunged; others have been altered and references added. The book, therefore, contains a vast amount of pious and excellent matter, but continues to be deformed by occasional notes entirely out of keeping with the rest of the work. It will be understood that our strictures on this commentary in our previous number, as well as the present notice, relate exclusively to the fifth volume, which is the only one which we have examined.

A Dissertation on Oaths. By Enoch Lewis. 12mo. pp. 100.

A defence of the Quaker doctrine on this subject, from the Scriptures and the Fathers.

Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Genesis; designed as a general help to biblical reading and instruction. By George Bush, Prof. of Hebrew and Oriental Literature, New York City University. In two volumes. Vol. I. 12mo. pp. xxxvi.

As we learn that this interesting work has met with a very encouraging reception, we regret the less, that the extended notice of it, which we mean to take, must be deferred till a future number.

An Address delivered before the Union Literary Society of Miami University, at its thirteenth annual celebration, Aug. 8th, 1838. By John C. Young, President of Centre College. 8vo. pp. 29.

The Inaugural Address of the Rev. R. H. Morrison, D.D., pronounced at his inauguration as President of Davidson College, North Carolina, Aug. 2, 1838. Published by request of the Board of Trustees. 8vo. pp. 23.

Sound doctrine well expressed, with perhaps too much quotation, and an excess of proper names, and without originality, except upon the point of manual labour, which the author wishes to see introduced, not only into colleges and schools, but into society at large, as an accomplishment of educated men, and a means both of physical and moral discipline.

The Subject and Spirit of the Ministry. A sermon preached before the Synod of New York at the opening of its late revisions at Newburgh, Oct. 16, 1838. By Erskine Mason, Moderator of the Synod. 8vo. pp. 34.

Faith the Life of Science. An Address delivered before the Phi Beta Phi Society of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., July 1838. By Tayler Lewis. 8vo. pp. 38.

An excellent corrective of utilitarian nonsense with respect to education. The train of thought and manner of expression are of that manly, scholar-like description, which we had begun to think extinct among us, and which can only be revived by a recurrence to the liberal and thorough training of that good old school, to which the author of this pamphlet must undoubtedly belong. If he has gone too far in undervaluing material science and inductive reasoning, or overlooked the dangers which demonstrably beset the 'high priori road,' these

are errors and excesses which are not very likely to do serious mischief in our age and country.

The Inaugural Address of the Rev. P. J. Sparrow, A.M., pronounced at his inauguration as Professor of Languages, in Davidson College, North Carolina, Aug. 2, 1838. 8vo. pp. 24.

Another anti-utilitarian pamphlet, but with more specific reference to the study of the classics, and in style very different from that of the preceding. The good qualities by which it is distinguished, lose much of their effect, by a colloquial carelessness of manner.

Claims of the Gospel Ministry to an Adequate Support. An Address of the Presbytery of Elizabethtown to the Churches under its Care. 8vo. pp. 23.

This is a judicious and able exhibition of an important subject. An extended notice of it, which we had prepared for the present number, is crowded out, and will appear in our next.

The American Student. A Valedictory Address to the Senior Class of the Oneida Institute, delivered September 12, 1838. By Beriah Green. Published by request of the Senior Class. Whitesboro. 8vo. pp. 32.

A mingled compound of smartness, effrontery, ignorance, and vulgarity, in which the author proves that men may become learned without learning; that they may be educated, without the means of education; and that Oneida Institute, with its homoeopathic doses, is the true and only hope of our country.

An Inaugural Address, delivered by the Rev. Joseph Smith, A.M., upon his entrance on the office of President of Frederick College, Frederick City, Md., October, 1838. Frederick. 8vo. pp. 16.

A Brief Examination of the Nature and use of the Drinks mentioned in the Scriptures: with some Remarks suggested by the Connexion of the Subject with the Cause of Temperance. By A. O. Hubbard. Sherbrooke, L. C. 8vo. pp. 16.

This tract, though brief, and not dignified by a Prize, contains a candid and thorough examination of the subject. The method and spirit of the author are worthy of all praise, in these days when even good men are so ready to pervert the scripture in support of any foregone conclusion.

Old and New Theology: or an Exhibition of those Differences with regard to Scripture Doctrines which have recently agitated, and now divided the Presbyterian Church. By James Wood. Philadelphia. 8vo. pp. 243.

This is a seasonable and important publication. It furnishes an account, in extracts from different writers, of the doctrinal errors which have been recently broached and advocated within the pale of our Church, as well as upon its borders. The outcry of misrepresentation cannot well be raised when an author's own words are employed in the statement of his opinions. And no one can read this book, without being brought to the conviction that grave errors, if estimated according to the formularies of our church, have been taught by those who professed agreement with our standards. We consider the public as much indebted to Mr. Wood for this volume. He has executed his task with fidelity and judgment. The spirit of his book is as commendable as its matter and style. It is marked by uniform mildness and respectfulness towards those from

whom the author differs. It contains nothing that can give offence, unless it be the stubborn and unsightly facts which it discloses. We commend it to all, and especially to such as have been persuaded to believe that no serious doctrinal errors had made their way into our church.

Errors in Theory, Practice, and Doctrine. A Sermon delivered before the Synod of Genesee, at their Annual Meeting, at Buffalo, October 10, 1838. By John C. Lord, A.M. Pastor of the Pearl Street, Church Buffalo, 8vo. pp. 18.

This Sermon is a faithful call upon the ministry of reconciliation "to resist the alarming innovations upon the doctrine and order of the Church, which, under the colour of alleged discoveries of new and more correct interpretations of the Sacred Scriptures, are making fearful progress in portions of our Zion." It is worthy of attention both on account of its intrinsic merit, and of the quarter whence it comes.

True Consolation in Death. A Sermon on the Life and Character of the Rev. Thomas Morrell, for fifty three years a Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Preached in the first Presbyterian Church, Elizabethtown, September 9th, 1838. By Nicholas Murray. Elizabethtown, N. J. 8vo pp. 31.

A just and eloquent tribute to the memory of a revolutionary soldier, a venerable patriarch of the Methodist Church, and a most estimable man.

Religion of the Bible, in Select Discourses. By Thos. H. Skinner. New York, 12mo. pp. 323.

The Life and Character of Rev. Samuel H. Stearns. Second edition. Boston. 12mo. pp. 252.

The Popular Objections of Infidelity, stated and answered, in a series of Lectures addressed to the Young men of Buffalo. By John C. Lord, A.M. Pastor of the Pearl street church. Buffalo. 16mo. pp. 223.

Ornament; or the Christian Rule of Dress; containing strictures on Hudson's "Letters to Christian Females, on Plain Dress." In a series of letters, by Mrs. Mary I. Torrey. Boston. 1838. pp. 68.

Riches without Wings, or the Cleveland Family. By Mrs. Seba Smith. Boston and New York, 1838. 16mo. pp. 162.

Bogota in 1836-7; being a narrative of an expedition to the capital of New Grenada, and a residence there of eleven months. By J. Stewart. New York.

The Crook in the Lot, or a Display of the Sovereignty and Wisdom of God in the Afflictions of Men, and the Christian Deportment under them. By Rev. Thomas Boston. Philadelphia. 16mo. pp. 162.

An Illustration of the Types, Allegories, and Prophecies of the Old Testament. By William M'Ewen, Minister of the Gospel at Dundee. Philadelphia. 16mo. pp. 272.

CONTENTS OF NO. I.

- ART. I.**—Life of Joseph Brant Thayendanegea : including the Border Wars of the American Revolution, and Sketches of the Indian Campaigns of Generals Harmar, St. Clair, and Wayne, and other matters connected with the Indian Relations of the United States and Great Britain, from the Peace of 1783 to the Indian Peace of 1795. By William L. Stone. 1
- ART. II.**—Bible Class Manual : or a System of Theology, in the order of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, adapted to Bible Classes. By John M'Dowell, D.D., Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. 31
- ART. III.**—1. Elements of Psychology, included in a Critical Examination of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, with Additional Pieces. By Victor Cousin, Peer of France, Member of the Royal Council of Public Instruction, Member of the Institute, and Professor of the History of Ancient Philosophy in the Faculty of Literature. Translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. C. S. Henry, D.D.
 2. Introduction to the History of Philosophy. By Victor Cousin, Professor of Philosophy of the Faculty of Literature at Paris. Translated from the French, by Henning Gottfried Linberg.
 3. An Address delivered before the Senior Class in Divinity College, Cambridge, Sunday, 15th July, 1838. By Ralph Waldo Emerson. 37
- ART. IV.**—Fragments from the study of a Pastor. By Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the City of New York. 102
- ART. V.**—General History of Civilization in Europe, from the fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. Translated from the French of M. Guizot, Professor of History to La Faculté des Lettres of Paris, and Minister of Public Instruction. 114

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL 1839.

No. II.

- ART. I.—1. *The Chinese : A General Description of the Empire of China and its Inhabitants.* By John Francis Davis, Esq. F. R. S., &c. In 2 vols. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1836.
2. *The Stranger in China ; or, The Fan-qui's visit to the Celestial Empire, in 1836-7.* By C. Toogood Downing, Esq., Mem. Roy. Coll. Surgeons. In 2 vols. 12mo. Philadelphia. 1838.
3. *China ; its State and Prospects, with especial reference to the spread of the gospel ; containing allusions to the Antiquity, Extent, Population, Civilization, Literature, and Religion of the Chinese.* By W. H. Medhurst, of the London Missionary Society. Boston. 1838.

THE empire of China has for the last three centuries been drawing an increasing amount of attention from western nations. At the present time it is awakening universal interest among commercial and Christian people. It is by no means surprising that it should. Even independently of the commercial advantages which it presents, and the importance of bringing it under Christian influence, it affords subjects of inquiry well adapted to arouse the curiosity of the human

mind. Its antiquity, extent, and immense population combined under a single autocrat, together with the singular characteristics and customs of its people, present interesting themes for speculation and research. From the earliest antiquity until the present time this great country has remained almost entirely the same in its language, customs, and the genius and spirit of its people. Its inhabitants are almost as different from other nations as if they belonged to another planet. Had the great northern wall entirely surrounded it from the most ancient period, and wholly debarred it from intercourse with other parts of the globe, a greater difference than the present could hardly be conceived. It remained for ages unknown to Europeans and the inhabitants of Western Asia. The conqueror of the world little thought how incomplete was his victory while this extensive and thickly peopled portion of his imaginary conquest lay untouched and undisturbed by him.

Until quite modern times very little was known of it by the rest of the world. Some who lived about the time of the Christian era and a little after, seem not to have been altogether ignorant of the existence of such a people, from the mention that is made of *Sinæ*, in the remotest parts of Asia, from which silks were brought by the way of Bactria. In the time of the emperor Trajan, a Chinese general, in the wars which his countrymen were carrying on with the Tartars, is said to have reached the borders of the Caspian Sea. The emperor Marcus Antoninus despatched an embassy to learn more of the country whence the Romans received so many silks, but the attempt proved unsuccessful.

In the ninth century the Arabs, while pushing on their conquests, gained some knowledge of China. The itineraries of two Arabian travellers who lived about that time have been translated, and exhibit the Chinese the same people then that they are found to be now. The intercourse between China and India appears to have commenced at an early period.

Marco Polo, the Venetian, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, brought to Europe the first accurate and extensive accounts ever published there respecting China, after a residence in the empire of seventeen years. His reports about the vast wealth and resources of that country were discredited and even ridiculed. About this time the Romanists sent their first missionaries to China, and Corvino was constituted bishop of Peking. The Christian church, after

his death, sunk into insignificance, and no more attempts were made to introduce the Christian religion until the beginning of the sixteenth century. Soon after the passage round the Cape of Good Hope had been performed by the Portuguese, and they had established themselves at Goa on the coast of Malabar, and taken possession of Malacca, they proceeded to China. Their first acts were such as to give that nation not the most favourable idea of Europeans, and their subsequent conduct was little better. Romish missionaries were soon sent to China, among whom was the celebrated Francis Xavier. Through their numerous writings, although tinged with prejudice, exaggeration, and nonsense, much sound and useful information was conveyed to their brethren at home. By the middle of the sixteenth century the Portuguese were established at Macao, and had commenced something like a regular commerce. The Dutch soon made attempts to effect a similar object, but did not succeed till nearly a century afterwards, when they formed a settlement on the west side of Formosa, opposite to the Chinese coast; but from this station they were at length expelled by the influx of Chinese population. The Russians near the close of the seventeenth century sent an embassy over land to the court of Peking. This was favourably received, and followed by several others.

The first attempt made by the English to establish an intercourse with China was in the time of Elizabeth, who despatched three ships to China with a letter to the emperor. They were however lost, and the project does not appear to have been revived until many years afterwards. The oldest date of English ships at Canton was in the spring of 1637, when a company of four arrived. The Portuguese did all in their power to misrepresent the designs of the English, and prejudice the natives against them. The troubles of the latter from this source continued for a long course of years, and rendered their trading exceedingly difficult. The conduct of the Portuguese has in all probability done much to exclude foreigners from the Chinese ports. It is pretty certain that a few centuries ago the Chinese were favourably disposed to holding a free intercourse with other nations. But the suspicion and jealousy of the Manchow Tartar dynasty, strengthened by the rapacity and slanders of the Portuguese at Canton and Macao, have confined commerce to a single port, and laid it under the most severe restrictions. The English attempted in vain to open a trade at Ningpo,

Chu-san, and other places north of Canton. Though confined to the latter port, their trade continued increasing, and finally became so important as to call for the mission of Lord Macartney to the court of Peking in 1792. One of the principal objects of this mission was to obtain permission to trade at other ports besides Canton ; but this result could not be accomplished. The embassy however had the effect of drawing a much greater share of the public attention towards China, and of leading more to the study of the language, literature, institutions, and manners of that vast and singular empire. Through the journals of two gentlemen of the company, Sir George L. Staunton and Mr. Barrow, much new and valuable information was communicated to the world. The extortion and oppression which the British still continued to suffer at Canton, without the knowledge of the court, occasioned the embassy of Lord Amherst in 1816. One of the gentlemen who accompanied him is the author of an excellent work now before us. It has already been before the public some time, and, to those who are acquainted with it, needs no recommendation. Mr. Davis, the learned and accomplished writer to whom we allude, has, in a neat and elegant style, presented us with an interesting and satisfactory account of the manners and customs, the social, political, and religious institutions, together with the natural productions, the arts, manufactures and commerce of China. The recent appearance of two other works on the same subject, is no ordinary cause of gratification. This country has been creating so much interest in reference to Christian missions as to render a systematic and popular account of it, accessible to the generality of English readers, a great desideratum. Hitherto no work of this kind has appeared; but these five volumes bring a vast amount of most valuable and important knowledge within the reach of every reader of the English language. The author of 'The Stranger in China' has drawn a picture of Canton and its vicinity, described the moral condition of the river and city population, and treated at considerable length of the manners, politics, and religions of China; thus combining the entertainment of a book of travels with the solid instruction of a digested and systematic treatise. His style is remarkably pleasant and animated. In his descriptions Dr. Downing has succeeded very happily. Whatever object or scene he has attempted to describe is vividly painted and brought completely before the imagination. From the Ladrone Islands he conducts us to Macao, and

from Macao to Whampoa, pointing to every object, and giving a full account of every thing on the way worthy of notice. At Whampoa our attention is called to the large fleet of foreign ships anchored in the Reach, and a beautiful view of a charming scene is laid before us. While making the remaining voyage up to Canton we see, almost with the impression of real vision, every species of native vessels, from the heavy and clumsy junk down to the little san-pan, the flats covered with paddy, the windings of the different channels of the river, the miserable abodes of human beings floating on the water, the extreme wretchedness and poverty in which thousands are dragging out their existence, the immense crowds of the multitudes who are night and day thronging the river, and the idleness and vice that every where constantly abound. Mr. Medhurst has with a pious spirit, and in an able, judicious, and lucid manner, given us a view of China in its various aspects, with special reference to the spread of the gospel. We earnestly desire that his work may have a place in every Sabbath school library, and be extensively circulated among Christian families.

We shall occupy the remainder of the pages allowed to us in endeavouring to lay before our readers some of the contents of these valuable and interesting volumes. It will be as well to begin with Canton, after which we shall proceed mainly in the order of Mr. Medhurst. The pride and jealousy of the Tartar dynasty have confined the foreign trade of China to a single port of a single province, that province divided from the rest of the empire by a barrier of high mountains, and chosen as the point farthest distant from the capital. The national arrogance of the Chinese is excessive. Their own country is denominated by them, 'the flowery nation,' 'the region of eternal summer,' 'the land of sages,' 'the celestial empire,' while they call all foreigners 'barbarians,' or load them with epithets still more degrading and contemptuous. This national trait is well illustrated by the soliloquy of a native. "I felicitate myself that I was born in China; and constantly think how very different it would have been with me, if born beyond the seas, in some remote part of the earth, where the people, deprived of the converting maxims of the ancient kings, and ignorant of the domestic relations, are clothed with the leaves of plants, eat wood, dwell in the wilderness, and live in the holes of the earth; though living in this world in such a condition, I should not have been different from the beasts

of the field. But now, happily, I have been born in the middle kingdom. I have a house to live in; have food, drink, and elegant furniture; clothing, caps, and infinite blessings; truly the highest felicity is mine!" From this proud feeling of the people, and from the jealousy of the government, proceeds the present exclusive policy. The government is not inactive in cherishing a contempt for all foreigners. It is a stretch of imperial indulgence that permits the 'barbarians' to come and trade with them at all. The whole space allowed to them at Canton has a frontage of not more than seven or eight hundred feet along the bank of the river in the south-western suburb, and extends for about half a mile from the shore to the gates. The foreign factories, the number of which is thirteen, together with a large portion of the suburb in which they are situated, are built on a muddy flat which has been gained from the river, and they are consequently erected on wooden piles, only just above high water marks. Some portion of this space is in heavy rains and high tides often inundated, the effect of which in a hot climate is highly noxious. In this contracted space are crowded together Englishmen, Frenchmen, Americans, Danes, Swedes, Dutch, Parsees,* Austrians, Russians, Prussians, Spaniards, Portuguese, and various other tribes of 'barbarians who inhabit the Great Western Ocean.' All the foreigners are committed to the care of a set of men called Hong merchants, who are appointed by the government to transact or have an oversight of all the business and intercourse carried on with them, carefully watch their conduct, and be responsible for their good behaviour. All the buildings of the foreign factories are in their power to let them out to such persons and for such purposes as they choose. No food or provisions of any kind can be procured by foreigners but from persons authorized by the security merchants to sell to them; and no native servant can be procured but such as are furnished or licensed by the same authority. The intercourse of the Hong merchants with the barbarians is watched with a jealous eye by the officers of government, and if too much intimacy or friendly feeling with them is at any time suspected, the poor merchant guilty of it is fleeced of his property, bamboozed, or sent into exile, according to the good pleasure of the haughty and arbitrary mandarin. The most burdensome taxes and impositions are

* A class of Asiatic merchants trading between China and Bombay.

constantly put upon barbarians. They are considered incapable of being governed by the laws of the celestial empire, and consequently those laws afford them no protection. Hence their circumstances are often most trying and unpleasant, while no redress of grievances can be had from the imperial government. All who go to Canton, whatever may have been their rank in their own nation, receive from all the Celestials, even the most base and degraded, the same kind of insult, and consequently hear the term *Fan-qui*, 'foreign ghost' or 'devil,' applied to them. Mothers teach their children from infancy to shout this epithet to the stranger. Among the river population when a boat with strangers is passing, Dr. Downing remarks, "you will frequently see the mothers in the boats holding up their babies to see the *Fan-quis* as they pass, just as with us they are apt to do, when they show a child a chimney sweeper or a Sambo, if they wish to quiet them when they cry, or to make them cry when they are quiet." The same spirit prevails throughout the empire. The title given to Lord Macartney, one of the most polished noblemen of Europe, was, 'The red-bristled barbarian, tribute-bearer.'

The difficulties with which the missionary meets in Canton are far greater than those of the merchant. The latter is, in virtue of his business, allowed to remain there a part of the year, but the residence of the former among the Chinese, and all his efforts for their conversion, are a direct breach of the law. It is also against the law for a native to assist any barbarian in acquiring the language of the 'flowery nation,' or for a foreigner to print native books. On these accounts missionaries are obliged to proceed with the greatest caution, and to pursue their studies and labours in retirement, for fear of being observed by the authorities. If their plans and designs were once discovered, they would not be tolerated a single day. Sometimes a cry is raised about the 'traitorous natives,' when the missionaries' native teachers are obliged to flee for safety, and conceal themselves for a time, while their pupils are requested not to speak the Chinese language in the streets, nor stand looking at native handbills, lest some police officer observing it, should trace them to their factory, and procure the arrest of the compradores who permitted them to study, or of the teachers who assisted them in acquiring the language.

The population of Canton has by some been set down at a million. Against this estimate it is argued that, within

the precincts of six or seven miles, the whole circuit of the city, and in houses of only one story high, it is altogether incredible such an immense multitude can be crowded. No inconsiderable part of the population is contained in the floating town, or mass of floating huts, the number of which is 80,000, covering the water for some acres in extent. These people are treated by the government as a very different race from those on shore, and are not allowed to intermarry with them. Their origin is a mystery at the present day, and their history is involved in considerable obscurity. The former emperors forbade them to land, or to have any intercourse with the people on shore; and even now they are utterly despised, although one of the late emperors of the present dynasty naturalized them, and allowed them to live on shore, as soon as they had acquired sufficient property to purchase a small estate. They pass their lives in a wretchedly poor condition, dwelling in what are called 'egg-house' boats, from their shape resembling the longitudinal section of an egg, generally not more than ten or twelve feet long, about six broad, and so low that a person can scarcely stand up in them. They are exempt from most duties to government, and live under a separate regulation. As a class they are lawless, vicious, and degraded. In addition to these, the river is crowded with every variety of craft containing thousands of imperial subjects who are the most debased and abandoned of human beings. "The first journey up to Canton," says Dr. Downing, "has made such an impression on me, that I think it never could be erased if I were to live for a thousand years to come. You feel perfectly awed and overcome, and, although habit may somewhat abate the astonishment after frequent visits, a person would be excused, if upon his first progress up to Canton he should really believe that he was at the entrance of Pandemonium." Some of the worst features of human depravity are also exhibited among the lower classes in the city, or in the part appropriated to foreign trade. It is however generally agreed that the Chinese appear in their worst phase at Canton, and that a judgment respecting the state of morals in other parts of the empire should not be formed from what is exhibited in that city.

It would be a hopeless task to attempt to explain, on certain grounds, how China first became peopled. A variety of opinion has existed on this subject. One assertion has been, that the Chinese were originally Tar-

tars; another that they descended from an ancient colony of Egyptians; and another is that of the Brahmins, who allege that they were originally Hindoos. Sir William Jones in a learned discourse on this subject quotes the following curious passage from the Sanscrit Institutes of Menu, "Many families of the military class, having gradually abandoned the ordinances of the Veda, and the company of the Brahmins, lived in a state of degradation; as the people of Pundraca, the Chinas, and other nations."* He considers it highly probable that the whole Chinese nation descended from the Chinas of Menu, and mixing with the Tartars, formed by degrees the race of men whom we now see in possession of that empire. Another opinion is that held by a large number of missionaries,—that the Chinese sprang from some of the immediate descendants of Noah. This opinion is founded chiefly on what they suppose to be traditions of events recorded in the Mosaic history. The Chinese themselves lay claim to very great antiquity, although they have no written records older than those of Confucius. Once the extravagant chronology of the Chinese was gladly caught at by sceptics, with the hope of weakening the credibility of the comparatively recent account of Moses; but a mere statement of the truth of the matter is sufficient to set this subject entirely at rest. The Chinese have two periods, one of which they consider authentic, and the other fabulous, the former extending back but a short time in comparison with the latter. Their most celebrated historians attach very little credit to the mythological period, as Mr. Davis and Mr. Medhurst have shown by quotations from their writings. The latter gentleman, though he considers the first part of Chinese history as entirely fabulous, suggests the idea that the whole is probably based on some indistinct recollections of the history of the creation. "Of the first man, they say, that soon after the period of emptiness and confusion, when heaven and earth were first separated, Pwan-koo was produced; his origin is not ascertained, but he knew intuitively the relative proportions of heaven and earth, with the principles of creation and transmutation. During the supposed reign of the celestial, terrestrial, and human emperors, they allege that the year was settled, the months and days arranged, and the hills and rivers divided; all which may be but distant allusions to

* Asiatic Researches, Vol. II. p. 368, etc. London, 1799.

the formation of the heavenly bodies, and the settlement of the earth and waters." In the next period, including ten generations, mention is made of the institution of marriage, the invention of music, the rebellion of a portion of the race, the confused mixture of the divine and human race, and the occurrence of a flood at the close. When, at the close of this period, Yu ascended the throne, the lands were drained by assiduous labour, and the country became habitable. Many, with Mr. Medhurst, have identified this with the Mosaic deluge, but Mr. Davis thinks it may refer to nothing more than an inundation from the Yellow river, which has repeatedly overflowed, and spread desolation over the countries through which it passes. Whether these extracts from their fabulous history are deemed worthy of consideration or not, it is generally allowed that China was settled at a very ancient period, and had a settled government several centuries before the Christian era.

No historical records exist older than those of Confucius, who was nearly contemporary with Herodotus. The period of authentic history may be considered as dating from the third dynasty, or the race of Chow, in whose time Confucius lived. This age was distinguished not only by the birth of Confucius, but also by the appearance of Laou-tsze, the founder of another system of religion and morals, widely differing from that of the former. It is remarkable that about the same time Buddhism arose in India. These three systems have for hundreds of years overspread and influenced the population of China. The estimation, however, which they have respectively enjoyed has been very different. The memory and the doctrines of Confucius have met with almost uninterrupted veneration; while the absurd superstitions of the other two have been alternately embraced and despised by the different sovereigns of the country. After the death of Confucius, which happened B. C. 477, when he was seventy-three years of age, a series of sanguinary contests ensued, which at length resulted in the overthrow of the Chow dynasty, and the establishment of the fourth dynasty called Tsin. The chief government now began to assume the aspect of an empire, which comprehended that half of modern China lying to the north of the great Keang river; but which after the lapse of a few centuries was again split into several parts.

About this time the Tartars had begun to make serious invasions from the north, and the first ruler of Tsin render-

ed himself forever famous by the erection of the great wall, about two hundred years before the Christian era, or more than two thousand years from the present time. This stupenduous monument of human labour bounds the whole north of China, extending from the Gulf of Peking to Western Tartary, a distance of fifteen hundred miles. "The gentlemen of Lord Macartney's embassy had the good fortune to pass into Tartary by one of the most entire portions of the wall, and a very particular examination of the structure was made by Captain Parish. On the first distant approach, it is described as resembling a prominent vein or ridge of quartz standing out from mountains of gneiss or granite. The continuance of this line over the mountain tops arrested the attention, and the form of a wall with battlements was soon distinctly discerned. It was carried over the ridges of the highest hills, descended into the deepest valleys, crossed upon arches over the rivers, and was doubled in important passes, being, moreover, supplied with massy towers or bastions at distances of about one hundred yards. One of the most elevated ridges crossed by the wall was five thousand feet above the level of the sea. The body of the wall consists of an earthen mound, retained on each side by walls of masonry and brick, and terraced by a platform of square bricks. The total height, including a parapet of five feet, is twenty feet, and its thickness at the base twenty-five feet, diminishing to fifteen at the platform. The towers are forty feet square at the base, diminishing to thirty at the top, and about thirty-seven feet in total height. At particular spots, however, the tower was of two stories, and forty-eight feet high. The bricks are, as usual in China, of a bluish colour. This led to a doubt of their having been burnt, but some ancient kilns were observed near the wall, and, since then, the actual experiment of Dr. Abel in 1816 has proved that the brick-clay of the Chinese, being red at first, burns blue."* It has been estimated that this structure contains materials sufficient to surround the whole globe, on one of its largest circles, with a wall several feet in height.

The same ruler that built the wall gave orders that all the books of the learned, including the works of Confucius, should be committed to the flames. More than four hundred persons, in attempting to oppose or evade the order, are said to have been burnt with the books they wished to save.

* Mr. Davis.

The works of Confucius were afterwards discovered in the wainscot of an old house. One reason alleged for this singular proceeding is, the desire that posterity should hear of none of his predecessors, and that he should appear to have been the first ruler of the empire.

The great wall did not answer the purpose for which it was intended. Though it operated in some degree as a check upon the Tartars, yet they continued their incursions; and during the whole of the next dynasty, called Han, which lasted till after the Christian era, the Huns, as they are termed in the histories and fictions of that period, troubled the Chinese by their predatory warfare. Their influence continued increasing during the reigns of several successive races, till at length the Chinese seemed on the verge of being entirely subdued by the Eastern Tartars. The Mongols, however, under Koblai Kahn, took possession of the northern half of modern China in the thirteenth century, and founded what is called the Yuen dynasty. Under the reign of Koblai Kahn, and his immediate successors, the vast imperial canal was constructed, which, in point of extent and magnitude, is unrivalled by any other work of the kind in the whole world. It extends about six-hundred miles from north to south, serving as an easy inland conveyance through some of the most fertile provinces, and as a drain to the swampy country through which it flows.

The Mongols held the empire but little more than eighty years. It then passed back into the hands of the Chinese, A. D. 1366, under what is called the Ming dynasty. The last of the Mongols, descendants of Koblai Kahn, after their expulsion, sought refuge among the Eastern Tartars, and from their intermarriages with the natives sprung the Manchow princes. These having eventually succeeded in obtaining the sovereignty, A. D. 1644, established the Manchow Tartar dynasty, which has held the government until the present day. The sixth of these emperors, entitled Taonkwang, is now reigning. Mr. Davis remarks that this family has already shown no unequivocal symptoms of degeneracy. "Many have been led by the events of recent years to surmise that the end of the Tartar dominion in China is at hand. The Mongol race were driven out by the Chinese after a much shorter possession than the Manchows have already enjoyed." It is worthy of remark that at this time there exists a secret association, called the Triad Society, one object of which it is to subvert and expel the Tartar dynasty. It

has been a special object of jealousy, dread, and persecution by the government; but in spite of all their efforts to exterminate it, it has increased and spread itself to no inconsiderable extent.

The Tartars have not only left the Chinese in possession of their forms and institutions, but have, in most respects, conformed to them themselves; and thus their territory has in fact been brought into the Chinese empire. The empire, thus constituted, covers a large portion of the surface of our globe. China Proper, with its eighteen rich and fertile provinces, is a compact area measuring in extreme length from north to south about twelve hundred geographical miles, with an average breadth from east to west of nearly the same extent. External to the main body of the empire are the two large islands of Formosa and Hainan. The former lies opposite the coast of Fokien, distant from it at the nearest point little more than sixty miles. The length is nearly two hundred geographical miles, with an average breadth of about fifty. The island is divided longitudinally by a ridge of high mountains; and the western part is considered as a portion of the opposite province of Fokien. The eastern part is still inhabited by the aborigines of the island, a savage race bearing some common resemblance to the Malays, and to the inhabitants of the islands of the Pacific. Hainan is rather smaller than Formosa, and forms a part of the province of Canton. The countries that periodically forward their tribute to Peking are Corea, Cochin China, Loochoo, and Siam. The Chinese, however, affect to consider all countries tributary that have once sent an ambassador; thus, after Lord Macartney's embassy, it was recorded, that tribute had been sent by the king of England to the 'Son of Heaven.'

Such various and discordant estimates have been made of the population of China, and so imperfect are the data with which a calculation can be made, that it is extremely difficult to arrive at any thing like precision on this point. Certain it is, that the country teems with an amazing amount of human beings. The natural advantages which it possesses for sustaining a large population are very great. Not the least are the fertility and moisture imparted to the soil by the innumerable branches of those two great trunks, the Yellow and Yangtsze-keang rivers; which, after sweeping away, as if by design to benefit the soil, the former beyond the great wall in the north, and the latter to the south, at length

approach each other to within about a hundred miles, and are emptied into the Yellow Sea. Large tracts of land, indeed, are so hilly or marshy as to be incapable of cultivation; but the valleys and level plains are remarkably productive. It is the universal testimony, that every portion of ground capable of improvement is turned to account. Out of the 830,719,360 English acres which China contains, observes Mr. Medhurst, a late estimate has given 640,579,381 English acres, or more than three fourths of the whole area, as the extent of cultivated land. The greater part of this is devoted exclusively to raising food for the subsistence of man. It is divided into small patches of one or two acres each, occupied by separate individuals. These little plots are separated from each other by small ditches to carry off the surplus water, and frequently by little footpaths alone, so that no space is uselessly thrown away. No grazing farms nor meadows can be spared for cattle; and the very few that are kept are obliged to pick up their scanty subsistence from the herbage which grows on the footpaths, or the banks of the ditches between the fields; while by night or in the winter they are fed principally with straw or stalks. In preparing the ground for the insertion of the seed, a hoe or spade is sometimes the only instrument of labour that is used. "It is but rarely," remarks Dr. Downing, "that a plough is to be seen, and even then the family of the husbandman are yoked to it instead of horses. The women are not exempted from this laborious employment, as they are considered throughout this ungallant country vastly inferior to the men." In some parts of the country the plough is drawn through the soil by oxen, asses, and mules, yoked together indiscriminately; and in Canton province, by means of a small buffalo, of a dark gray or slate colour, called by the Chinese 'water ox,' from its propensity for wallowing in mire and muddy shallows.

The natives of China make no use of butter or cheese, and very seldom of milk, most of their food being derived directly from the vegetable kingdom. Few horses are kept for travelling, pomp, or war. Burdens are usually carried on men's shoulders; sedans, borne by a number of men, are employed for riding, and the very boats on their canals are drawn by human strength. Wheel carriages being rare, the roads are comparatively few and narrow; generally, with the exception of the public roads in the vicinity of the capital, consisting of raised pathways through the rice fields, or of

winding lanes over the mountains. So importunate is the demand for the necessities of life, that, in the fertile provinces, sufficient soil cannot be spared for burying the dead. The burial places are seldom selected in situations capable of agricultural use and improvement; but in some barren spot, as on the hill side, or under the craggy precipice. Where such places cannot be found, crying necessity forbidding the appropriation of tillable land to the service of the dead, the bodies are kept above ground until they decay, after which the bones are collected into jars, and taken care of by surviving friends.

The encouragement given to agriculture argues a dense population. The cultivators of the soil are esteemed next in rank to the literati. A ceremony in honour of this occupation is observed every year. The Emperor himself takes part in one of the ceremonials, while the viceroys and other grand mandarins superintend its management in the provinces. After his Celestial Majesty has prepared himself by fasting three days, and performing a number of minor ceremonies, he repairs to a field set apart for the purpose in the enclosure which surrounds the Temple of the Earth, where, the imperial hand being applied to the plough, a furrow is made of considerable length. Sacrifices of the fruits of the earth are also offered on the occasion.

The effect of the distinction conferred on agriculturists is, that China presents a country which is perhaps not exceeded by any part of the world for the produce of the vegetable subsistence of the human species; and that in the art of husbandry its inhabitants are superior to those of any other portion of Asia. In this business they are incessantly employed, raising two crops from the ground every year, extending their cultivation in every possible direction, and bringing the most unpromising spots into use, in order that nothing may be lost. They thoroughly understand the importance of varying the crops, and know perfectly well the seasons and soils adapted for certain productions. Their industry and perseverance are shown to great advantage in the plans which they adopt for procuring for their soil the too most essential auxiliaries, water and manure. Rice which is the staple production of the country requires a great quantity of water for its successful cultivation. To obtain a supply, small canals and troughs chiefly made of bamboo, lead through every plot of ground, and are adapted to each particular case with the greatest readiness and promptitude. "It will readily be believed,"

says Dr. Downing, "that there must be some great stimulus to such exertions as these, which are almost unprecedented in any other age or country. It is the stimulus of necessity which obliges these people to work constantly in this manner, upon pain of being starved if they neglect it in the slightest degree. No doubt, they feel somewhat impelled by the hope of distinction, which is constantly held out to those who deserve it; but this feeling would go but little way towards forming those habits of indefatigable industry, which are so generally prevalent. They know that they depend entirely upon themselves, and if they relax their exertions their ruin is the necessary consequence. The Chinese cannot, like some other people, depend upon any but their relations for support. It has been asserted, that with the exception of the honour and duty which is always paid by children to their parents, no such feeling as brotherly love or humanity appears to reside in their breasts. They would sit down as quietly and eat their own chow-chow if they saw another person before them, actually in the pangs of death from hunger, or look on with the same indifference, whether it were a rat or a Chinaman drowning beside them."

The economy exercised by the Chinese in their articles of dress, and in the room occupied by their dwellings, shows that ground must be to them an object of great importance. Unable to spare grazing land for the production of woollens, the mass of the lower orders of people are clothed in cotton, which can be raised at little expense of ground and labour. No less frugal are they of room in their dwellings. A room twenty feet square would afford sufficient space for a dozen people to eat, drink, work, trade, and sleep; while the streets of their towns and cities are so narrow, with a few exceptions, that it is quite possible to touch each side of the way as you pass along. In this manner the streets of Canton are laid out. No horses and carriages are to be seen, in place of which all sorts of porters are employed. These, together with swarms of tradesmen, mechanics and idlers, are every hour of the day stopping the way of the passenger. In the part of Peking, however, that contains the imperial residence, open spaces and broad streets are common.

The frugality of the common people in their diet is not less remarkable. It generally consists of rice, and salt fish, or salted vegetable, and, occasionally, of pork stewed down with vegetable preparations in the proportion of one to five. But the common food of the poor is sweet potatoes or yams,

with occasionally a little rice boiled in a large quantity of water. Beef is never eaten, and mutton very seldom. "Instead of beef and mutton, however," observes Mr. Medhurst, "the Chinese have recourse to dogs and cats, the flesh of which animals is equal in price to that of swine. In default of these, they have no objection to make a dish of rats and snakes; and cockroaches and other reptiles come in to be used either as food or medicine, by a people who are driven frequently to great straits for want of sustenance; animals that die of disease, and those already far gone in a state of decay, are, when discovered, eagerly devoured by a hungry peasantry in search of food. In short, the Chinese have the most unscrupulous stomachs imaginable; every thing animal, from the hide to the entrails,—and almost every thing vegetable, from the leaves to the roots, is made available to the support of life." At Canton 'the Stranger in China' was accustomed to see exposed for sale in little baskets, similar to hen-coops, rock-pigeons, quails, and other birds, with cats, little puppy-dogs, and rats. "When a customer approaches, he opens one of the baskets and takes out the little animal, a cat or a dog for instance, and holds it up by the hind leg to ascertain its weight, and then estimates its value accordingly."

With all this care and industry, the land does not appear capable of supporting the thousands who spring up on its surface. Hence, vast numbers who cannot get their bread on land are obliged to live upon water, not only at Canton, but on the inland lakes and rivers. The greater number of these poor people live upon such fish as they are able to catch, or skim the surface of the water for whatever may be floating thereon. The few grains of rice spilled during the delivery of a cargo are sought after by the half-starved wretches with the greatest avidity. In some of the provinces many people die of actual starvation. In times of scarcity occasioned by drought, inundation, locusts, blight, or mildew, imperial bounty is obliged to be extended to the sufferers. For this purpose a large quantity of grain is deposited in the various provinces, to be sold out at a cheap rate in such seasons. The encouragement given to the importation of grain, by the exemption from port duties at Canton, allowed by the present emperor to foreign ships loaded with rice, sufficiently indicates that the population is greater than the land is able to support. Another circumstance strengthening this opinion is the emigration that is constantly going forward every

year. This is expressly forbidden by the government, and those who go abroad are considered as forfeiting all claim to protection from the laws of their native country. Notwithstanding these restrictions, necessity compels multitudes to cross the wall, the desert and the sea. Some are found occupying the waste lands of Tartary, others pass into Thibet and Burmah; while great colonies are to be found at Siam, Cambodia, Tonquin, Cochin-China, Singapore, and in various islands of the Malayan Archipelago.

The question as to the prevalence of infanticide in China appears to be involved in some uncertainty. While some writers and travellers have doubted its existence, others represent it as prevailing in proportion to the general indigence of the people, and affording by its prevalence, a criterion by which to judge of the density of the population, and the poverty of the inhabitants. In the southern provinces the natives themselves are said to bear ample testimony to its existence, and that in a proportion which it is fearful to contemplate. It is confined wholly to females, and may in some degree result from the general feeling of neglect, and even contempt shown in this country towards them. A son is valued and cherished, while a daughter is despised and neglected; and this feeling carried to excess, may lead many, in extreme poverty, to perpetrate this horrid and unnatural crime.

The above considerations prepare us to credit a very high estimate of the Chinese population. The native statistical accounts are, with all their defects, the only sources of information on which much dependance can be placed. By these it appears that before the Tartar conquests, when the Chinese dwelt under their own emperors, or during the Ming dynasty, the population amounted to upwards of 60,000,000. At the invasion of the empire by the rulers of the present dynasty, the number of inhabitants was greatly diminished. After about fifty years, the official returns began to give rapidly increasing reports, and the last, those of 1812, reported 361,221,900 as the amount of souls in China Proper, besides the inhabitants of Chinese Tartary and Formosa.

The contemplation of so vast a population in reference to its future conversion, naturally appals the mind. "Could we bring one thousand individuals under instruction every day, and give them only a day's teaching each, it would take one thousand years to bring all the population of China thus under the sound of the gospel; and if even ten of these separate

thousands were every day converted to God, it would require one hundred thousand years to make all these mighty hosts savingly acquainted with divine truth." This view of the matter does indeed dishearten and depress the mind, and we might forever despair of the full accomplishment of so great a work, had we not the *promises* and *power* of Jehovah as the strong ground of our confidence.

China presents to the Christian missionary advantages which are altogether unknown in many pagan countries, namely, those connected with a high degree of civilization and intelligence. This will appear evident from a brief view of their manners and customs, inventions, arts, literature and institutions. Before, however, proceeding to this subject, it may be well to make a summary statement of their principal characteristics as a people. From the general attention paid to mental, and, in some degree, to moral instruction, result the industry, tranquility, and contentment, so prevalent in the bulk of the population. The advantageous features of their character, as mildness, docility, industry, peaceableness, subordination, and respect for the aged, are accompanied by the vices of specious insincerity and falsehood, with mutual distrust and jealousy. The important advantages which they possess, more especially in comparison with the adjoining countries, have given them the inordinate national pride, so offensive to other nations.

The remarkable politeness shown by them towards each other in their social intercourse, is thus spoken of by Mr. Medhurst:

"In no unchristian country do we find such attention paid to ceremony, such polish in daily intercourse, and so many compliments passing to and fro, as among the Chinese. In associating with friends, and in entertaining strangers, their politeness is remarkable. The poorest and commonest individual will scarcely allow a passenger to cross the door, without asking him in; should the stranger comply, the pipe is instantly filled and presented to his lips, or the tea poured out for his refreshment; a seat is then offered, and the master of the house does not presume to sit down, until the stranger is first seated. The epithets employed, when conversation commences, are in keeping with the character of the people. The familiar use of the personal pronoun is not indulged in; on the contrary, 'venerable uncle,' 'honourable brother,' 'virtuous companion,'—or 'excellent sir,'—in addressing a stranger, are used instead of the pronoun 'you;' and 'the worthless fellow,'—'the stupid one,'—'the late born,'—or the 'unworthy disciple,' instead of the pronoun 'I,' are terms of common occurrence. 'What is your noble patronymic?' is the first question; to which the usual reply is, 'my poverty-struck family name is so and so;' again, the question is asked respecting the 'honourable appellation, the exalted age, and the famous province,' of the stranger; which queries are replied to by applying to one's self the epithets of 'ignoble, short-lived, and vulgar;' and thus the conversation proceeds in a strain of compliment, the very commonness

of which proves the civilization of the people. The titles bestowed upon the relations of others, together with the humiliating light in which persons speak of their own connections, are also remarkable. 'Honorable young gentleman,' for a friend's son; and 'the thousand pieces of gold,' for his daughter, are usual appellations; while the individual replies, by bestowing the epithet of 'dog's son,' and 'female slave,' on his own offspring.

"The ceremonies observed on the invitation and entertainment of guests, are still more striking; complimentary cards are presented, and polite answers returned, all vying with each other in the display of humility and condescension.* On the arrival of the guest, considerable difficulty is found in arranging who shall make the lowest bow, or first enter the door, or take the highest seat, or assume the precedence at table; though the host generally contrives to place his guest in the most elevated position. When conversation commences, the mutual assent to every proposition, the scrupulous avoiding of all contradiction, and the entire absence of every offensive expression, or melancholy allusion, show what a sense these people entertain of politeness; while the congratulations or condolence lavished on every prosperous or adverse occasion, and the readiness displayed to 'rejoice with them that do rejoice, and to weep with them that weep,' manifest the degree of interest they appear to take in each other."

But though a civilized people, nothing could be more directly opposite to our own ideas of good taste than some of their customs. In articles of food the rich are no less fantastic than the poor are indiscriminate. The following description of a Chinese dinner, quoted by Mr. Davis from Captain Laplace, may serve to give an idea of their singularity in this and some other respects: "The first course was laid out in a great number of saucers of painted porcelain, and consisted of various relishes in a cold state, as salted earthworms, prepared and dried, but so cut up that I fortunately did not know what they were until I had swallowed them; salted or smoked fish, and ham, both of them cut into extremely small slices; besides which, there was what they call Japan leather, a sort of darkish skin, hard and tough, with a strong and far from agreeable taste, which seemed to have been macerated for some time in water. All these et ceteras, including among the number a liquor which I recognized to be soy, made from a Japan bean, and long since adopted by the wine-drinkers of Europe to revive their faded appetites or tastes, were used as seasoning to a great number of stews which were contained in bowls, and succeeded each other uninterruptedly. All the dishes without exception swam in soup. On one side figured pigeon's-eggs, cooked in gravy, together with ducks and fowls cut very small, and immersed in a dark-coloured sauce; on the other, little

* "An invitation to a private feast is conveyed some days before, by a crimson coloured ticket, on which is inscribed the time appointed, and the guest is entreated to bestow 'the illumination of his presence.'"—*Mr. Davis.*

balls made of shark's-fins, eggs prepared by heat; of which both the smell and taste seemed to us equally repulsive, immense grubs, a peculiar kind of sea-fish, crabs, and pounded shrimps." After describing the difficulty which he experienced in using his eating apparatus, which consisted of two little ivory sticks, tipped with silver, and a knife, with a long, narrow, and thin blade, he further remarks, "I contrived to eat with tolerable propriety a soup prepared with the famous bird's-nests,* in which the Chinese are such epicures. The substance thus served up is reduced into very thin filaments, transparent as ising-glass, and resembling vermicelli, with little or no taste." During the whole of the first course wine circulated freely, and toasts followed each other in rapid succession. On the appearance of the second course "the table was covered with articles in pastry and sugar, in the midst of which was a salad composed of the tender shoots of the bamboo, and some watery preparations that exhaled a most disagreeable odour." Bowls of plain rice, also, were now for the first time placed before each of the guests. Considerable embarrassment was experienced in thinking what use was on this occasion to be made of the chop-sticks. Not knowing whether the rice was to be eaten grain by grain, says Capt. L., "I waited until my host should begin, to follow his example, foreseeing that, on this new occasion, some fresh discovery would serve to relieve us from the truly ludicrous embarrassment which we all displayed: in a word, our two Chinese, cleverly joining the ends of their chop-sticks, plunged them into the bowls of rice, held up to the mouth, which was opened to its full extent, and thus easily shovelled in the rice, not by grains but by handfuls. Thus instructed, I might have followed their example; but I preferred making up with the other delicacies for the few attractions which, to my taste, had been displayed by the first course. The second lasted a much shorter time. The attendants cleared away every thing. Presently the table

* "These are made from the nests of the swallow, the *hirundo esculenta*, and imported in great quantities from the Eastern Islands under the name of *birds-nests*. It would appear, that these pretty little animals eat great quantities of a species of gelatinous sea-weed, the *sphæro-coccus cartilagineous*, and when it is sufficiently softened in the stomach, it is returned and used as plaster to cement the dirt and feathers of the nests together. After importation in their rough state, the bird's-nests are purified in immense manufactories built for the purpose, and are then fit for use. The soups are made by boiling them into a jelly with water, and adding among other things a fish called the *trepang*, and a great variety of spices and condiments."—*Stranger in China*.

was strewed with flowers, which vied with each other in brilliancy; pretty baskets, filled with the same, were mixed with plates which contained a vast variety of delicious sweetmeats as well as cakes, of which the forms were as ingenious as they were varied. By the side of the yellow plantain was seen the *litchi*, of which the strong, rough, and bright crimson skin defends a stone enveloped in a whitish pulp, which for its fine aromatic taste is superior to most of the tropical fruits. With these fruits of the warm climates were mingled those of the temperate zone, brought at some expense from the northern provinces; as walnuts, chestnuts, (small and inferior to those of France) apples, grapes, and Peking pears, which last, though their lively colour and pleasant smell attracted the attention, proved to be tasteless, and even retained all the harshness of wild fruits. At length we adjourned to the next room to take tea,—the indispensable commencement and close of all visits and ceremonies among the Chinese. According to custom, the servants presented it in porcelain cups, each of which was covered with a saucer-like top, which confines and prevents the aroma from evaporating. The boiling water had been poured over a few of the leaves, collected at the bottom of the cup; and the infusion, to which no sugar is ever added in China, exhaled a delicious fragrant odour, of which the best teas carried to Europe can scarcely give an idea.”

Mr. Davis has at considerable length illustrated the manners, and state of society among this most singular people, and to him we must refer our readers for further particulars.

The civilization of the Chinese appears in quite a respectable light when we consider their ingenuity, and the progress they had made centuries ago in the arts. There seems to be good reason for believing that they preceded Europe in what are justly considered three of the most important inventions or discoveries of modern times, the art of printing, the composition of gunpowder, and the magnetic compass. The use of the needle is credibly alluded to as early as B. C. 1114. It is also referred to at later periods in such a manner as to put it beyond question that it was known in that country long before the mariner's compass was used in Europe. Indeed it has been supposed, and with no small degree of plausibility, that the use of the needle, was communicated to Europe either directly or indirectly from the Chinese. The supposition is, that Gioia of Naples, who is commonly sup-

posed to have invented the compass at the commencement of the thirteenth century, may have obtained it from Marco Polo, or from some eastern traders. But however ancient their knowledge of this instrument, the art of navigation among the Chinese seems rather to have retrograded than advanced.

Whether the knowledge or tradition of the art of printing may not have travelled westward from China, through the channels of oriental intercourse, is a fair question for speculation. Nothing is more clear than that the Chinese were in possession of this contrivance in the tenth century. But this, like most of their other inventions, seems to have been little improved from its original state. Stereotype or block-printing has always been the mode which they have practised. Strictly speaking, 'the press of China' would be a misnomer, as no press whatever is used. The whole apparatus of the printer is made up of a vessel of liquid ink, a pile of paper, a brush to ink the block, and a rubber to make the paper take the impression. The business is managed with such execution that a man can throw off three thousand impressions in a day. The speed and cheapness of printing, with the low price of paper, enable the Chinese to furnish books to each other for next to nothing. Books are multiplied almost to an indefinite extent, and "it would not," says Mr. Medhurst, "be hazarding too much to say, that, in China, there are more books, and more people to read them, than in any other country of the world."

Paper was invented by the Chinese in the first century of the Christian era. The principle material from which it is manufactured is bamboo. Before this invention, books were formed of slips of bamboo, upon which they wrote with a style.

The invention of powder, as compounded of sulphur, salt-petre, and charcoal, is carried very far back by the Chinese, and was employed by them for purposes of amusement, in the shape of rockets and fire-works, (in which they excel at present) long before the use of guns was known either to them or to Europeans. Owing to the imperfection of the mixture and the impurity of the materials, their powder is inferior in strength to that produced in many other countries. The method of applying it to fire-arms was probably borrowed from Europeans.

But the ingenuity of the Chinese manifested in their two principal manufactures, silk and porcelain, even if they

could lay no other claim to originality, gives them a high rank among the nations of the world. The manufacture of silk has long been established among them, and the tradition of its invention is carried back into the mythological periods. "Thousands of years ago, when the inhabitants of England were going about with naked bodies, the very plebeians of China were clothed with silks; while the nobility there vied with each other in the exhibition of gold and embroidery, not much inferior to what they now display." The Chinese silks are still celebrated for their variety, richness of colour, and beauty of embroidery, and their crapes surpass any thing of the kind that can be produced in the western world. Crapes and silks are as commonly worn in China, except where poverty prevents, as cloth and leather are among us.

The manufacture of porcelain commenced in the seventh century; and the government has for the last thousand years paid much attention to the subject. The emperor Kien-loong, about fifty years ago, sent a person from court to make drawings of the whole process in its details. The two principal ingredients employed in the manufacture of this ware are silica and alumine, or flint and clay. The former called *petuntse*, is a white, hard, and strong substance, having a smooth surface, while the latter is a soft clay. The *petuntse* is pounded with difficulty in mortars, the pestles of which are worked by means of cogged wheels turned by a stream, and the powder is reduced to a fine paste by mixture with water. With this are mixed the ashes of fern, by which the vitreous glaze of the porcelain is produced. Earthen cases are then provided, in which to bake the ware, the round portions of which are turned on a lathe, and the others made in a mould. The unburnt *biscuit*, as it is called, is finished by smoothing and paring off all the inequalities by the hand, the bits taken off being pounded and worked to a milky consistence, to be used by the painters. The ware is then painted, one set of artists drawing the outline, and another filling in the colours, 'in order to render the workman's hand uniform, and keep his mind undiverted.' It is said that previous to baking, the same specimen of ware passes through twenty hands, and that before being sold, it has gone through more than double that number. After baking it in the furnaces, and packing it in tubs for sale, the whole is concluded by a ceremony of sacrificing and giving thanks to the god of the furnaces.

In speaking of the manufactures of China, it would be

quite an omission not to notice tea, with which they are supplying Great Britain and America in such large quantities. About the middle of the seventeenth century it was known in England rather as a curiosity than an article of use, but for more than a century past the use of it has grown with astonishing rapidity. The sorts commonly known are seven kinds of black, and six of green. Mr. Medhurst's catalogue of them may not be uninteresting:

"First,—Woo-e, or Bohea, so called from a famous range of hills in the province of Fuh-k'een, where this tea is grown. Second,—K'een-pei, or Campoi; literally, choice fire-dried teas. Third,—Kang-foo, or Congo; literally, work-people's tea. Fourth,—Pih-haou, or Pekoe; literally, white down tea. Fifth,—Paou-chung, or Pouchong, wrapped tea; so called from its being wrapped in paper parcels. Sixth,—Seaou-chung, or Souchong, small seeded tea. Seventh,—Shwang-che, Souchi, or Caper; literally, double compounded tea. The green teas are,—First, Sung-lo, fir-twigs tea; probably from its resemblance to fir-twigs. Second,—He-chun, or Hyson; literally, happy spring tea. Third,—Pe-cha, or Hyson skin; literally, skin tea. Fourth,—Tun-ke, or Twankay; literally, stream-station tea; probably from the place where it is collected. Fifth,—Choo cha, pearl tea, or gunpowder tea. Sixth,—Yu-ts'een Ouchain, or Young Hyson; literally, tea collected before the rains. The black teas are, generally, grown in the province of Fuh-k'een; and the green in Che-k'iang, or Gan-hwuy. The whole are brought over land to Canton, where they are shipped for the European market."

The exact manipulation of the tea leaf, he observes, is a secret still possessed by the Chinese, which foreigners have not been able fully to develop. Mr. Davis and Dr. Downing have given a fuller consideration to this article of commerce.

As relates to the fine arts, or those which minister rather to the pleasures than the wants of mankind, though the Chinese cannot hold so high a rank as most western nations, their knowledge and skill in some of them are by no means inconsiderable. In works of drawing and painting that do not require a knowledge of the nature of perspective, nor of the art of shading, they are sometimes very successful. They paint insects, birds, fruits, and flowers, very beautifully, and nothing can exceed the splendour and variety of their colours. The reader has no doubt seen and admired the brilliant tints and striking characteristics displayed in the rice paper drawings. In carving and engraving they excel. The most intricate and complicated characters are carved with surprising rapidity. "In seal engravings," says Mr. M. "they are not behind our own countrymen, and in ivory and ebony, tortoise-shell, and mother-of-pearl, their engraving surpasses that of most other artists. The celebrated Chinese balls, one

in the other, to the amount of seven or nine, all exquisitely carved, have puzzled many of our English friends; who have been at a loss to know, whether they were cut out of a solid piece, or cunningly introduced by some imperceptible opening, one within the other. There can be no doubt, however, of their having been originally but one piece, and cut underneath from the various apertures, which the balls contain, until one after another is dislodged and turned, and then carved like the first. The ivory work-boxes and fans, commonly sold at Canton, exhibiting the various figures standing out in very bold relief, may be considered as fair specimens of Chinese skill."

In reference to the sciences, the Chinese do not appear in so favourable a light as when speaking of their arts, although equal, perhaps, in this respect, to most other eastern nations. They have always, even from the times of their earliest kings, paid some attention to astronomy, or rather to the observation of the sky. Eclipses of the sun have been faithfully recorded, but, evidently, in total ignorance of their real causes. The appearance of a comet is always an occasion of terror and alarm. Astronomy, if such their science may be called, is studied mainly on account of the influence of the heavenly bodies on human affairs. By its aid they predict the rise and fall of dynasties, famines, pestilences, wars, and commotions, droughts and inundations. The arrangement of the calendar has always been considered a matter of great moment, and a special board is appointed and sustained for that purpose at Peking. The reader is aware that in this work the Jesuit missionaries rendered such important assistance as to become established at the head of the Astronomical Board, which station continued to be occupied by Europeans until only a few years since. It is probable that the present Chinese astronomers have acquired sufficient practical knowledge for the rough calculation of eclipses, and other routine matters of the same kind; but in the course of time another generation may perhaps require a fresh inoculation of foreign science, and it will then befit protestant missionaries to imitate the learning and enterprise of their Roman Catholic predecessors.

In medicine they are equally void of ground for boasting. Their earliest physicians were more celebrated for knowledge and discovery than those of later times. They have hundreds of books, and the country swarms with practition-

ers, and doctors' shops; but very little skill or real science is exhibited. By uniting astrology with medicine, they are led into endless blunders, confusion, and absurdity. Of the circulation of the blood, as the phrase is understood among us, they know nothing, although it is sometimes vaguely spoken of, and compared to the unceasing revolutions of the heavenly bodies. Knowing nothing distinctly of veins and arteries, nor of the internal structure of the human frame, they make no attempt to explain the manner in which the blood circulates. In surgery, they go no further than puncturing, cauterizing, drawing of teeth, and plastering, without attempting any operation in which skill or care is required.

Enough has been done for the Chinese at Canton by Europeans and Americans to convince them of the value and superiority of our medical science. The small-pox formerly committed dreadful ravages among them. Their mode of inoculation was to place a little of the virus, taken from a former patient, dried and reduced to powder, on cotton wool, and to insert this in the nostril. Blindness being an extremely common occurrence, the inflammation caused by this mode of inoculation is supposed to have occasioned the loss of sight in many cases. But both the small-pox, and the imperfect and injurious method of guarding against its effects, were destined to yield to the benign influence of vaccination, which was introduced, and ultimately established, by the active and persevering humanity of Mr. Pearson, principal surgeon of the British factory. Of late years a number of the missionaries have found some acquaintance with the healing art highly available to ensure the good wishes of the natives. The advantages which it has afforded to the excellent Prussian missionary, Mr. Gutzlaff, are already well known. Our countryman, Dr. Parker, is also gaining great influence, and the kindest feelings of the people, by the benefits bestowed on the afflicted in the hospital at Canton. The fame of this institution has already reached Nanking, the ancient metropolis, and at the present time the capital of literature; and it may be hoped, is doing much towards breaking down the barriers of prejudice and vanity among the enlightened portion of the population. According to present indications, medicine and surgery appear destined, under God, to operate as powerful means in opening and preparing the way for the introduction of the gospel into the interior of the empire.

In geography and the sciences of numbers, geometry,

chemistry, and botany, the Chinese have made such limited progress, as to render it unimportant now to dwell on these topics.

The reader will find the government and legislation of China fully treated of in either of the works before us. The whole government is based on a single principle, namely, that of parental authority. The emperor, revered as the parent and protector of the people, and considered as holding the throne by divine right, rules with absolute authority. The ministers to whom he delegates a portion of his authority, being the creatures of imperial power, can be degraded, bamboozed, banished, or beheaded, subject to the will or caprice of him who claims and exercises irresponsible authority. The prime ministers of state are four: the first a Manchow Tartar, the second a Chinese, the third a Mongol, and the fourth a Chinese. Under this cabinet are six tribunals, which take cognizance of their several departments, and report to the emperor for his decision and approval. These are,—the board of official appointments,—the board of revenue,—the board of rites and ceremonies,—the military board,—the supreme court of criminal jurisdiction,—and the board of public works. In addition to these, there are a few other public offices, among which is the grand national college at Peking, the members of which are all the chief of the literati of China. After having passed through three public literary examinations with honour, a select few are again tried, in order to their admission into this college. All matters with respect to literature, and many which regard politics, are referred to this board, while the principal officers of state are chosen from among its members. Every individual in the empire is eligible to this distinction, and every scholar looks forward to it, as the consummation of all his wishes. Thus, education is not only inculcated by positive precepts, but also encouraged by an open competition for the highest rewards. Wealth alone, though it has of course some necessary influence, is looked upon with less respect, comparatively, than perhaps in any other country; and this because all distinction and rank arise almost entirely from educated talent. The choice of official persons, who form the real aristocracy of the country, is guided, with a very few exceptions, by the possession of education and talent, and the test of these is afforded at the public examinations. Hence the country is as ably ruled as it could be under the circumstances. The examinations are open to the poorest persons; and only some

classes, as menial servants, comedians, and the lowest agents of the police, are excluded.*

It would be worth while to examine with more detail than our limits will permit, that very efficient engine for the control of this vast and densely thronged population,—the Chinese code of laws; since, being congenial to the dispositions and habits of the people for whom it was formed, it affords the best data for forming an estimate of their character. The whole code is divided into six sections, corresponding exactly to the six supreme boards or tribunals already mentioned.

The punishments for all offences against these laws are carefully provided for, and prescribed according to the nature of the transgressions. The bamboo is the grand panacea for all moral disorders where the crimes are not considered capital. The portions of this are dealt out by the mandarin or judge at whose tribunal the criminal is convicted. A small hollow cylinder, full of slips of wood, stands before the judge, and according to the nature of the offence he takes out a certain number, and throws them on the floor of the court. The culprit is then ordered to lay himself with his face downwards on the ground, and receive the blows attached to his offence. When the punishment is completed, he is made to kneel again, and is then obliged to thank the magistrate for the infliction before he is allowed to depart.

The punishment for offences of a higher order is the Cangue, a wooden collar, being a species of walking pillory, in which the prisoner is paraded with his offence inscribed. It is sometimes worn for a month together, and as the hand cannot be put to the mouth, the wearer must be fed by others. After this comes temporary banishment, to a distance not exceeding fifty leagues from the prisoner's home; and then exile beyond the Chinese frontier, either temporary or for life. The three capital punishments are, strangulation; for greater crimes, beheading; and for treason, "a disgraceful and lingering death."

Chinese prisons are very severe, and the most frequent instruments of judicial injustice are prolonged imprisonments. The prisoners, who are to be kept in them previously to their trial for capital offences or after their convic-

* For a particular account of Chinese education, and the mode in which the literary examinations are conducted, see p. 180 of the last volume of our Review.

tion, fear them much more than the threatened punishment. They are confined alone in loathsome dungeons which are so small that there is no possibility of sitting, standing, or lying down.

It was our design to speak somewhat particularly of the literature and religions of the Chinese, but the increasing number of our pages admonishes us to refer to these subjects very briefly. The literature of China, as is well known, is very abundant. The most esteemed of all the compositions in that language are the 'Five Classics' and the 'Four Books.' Of each of the former, Confucius was either the author or compiler. The first, called the 'Book of Diagrams,' contains a mystical exposition of the origin of created things, and of the changes that are perpetually occurring in nature. The 'Collection of Odes,' or, 'Book of Sacred Songs,' is a selection from a larger number, extant in the time of Confucius, and by him collected and published. The third, entitled 'the Book of Rites,' may be considered as the foundation of the present state of Chinese manners, and one of the causes of their uniform unchangeableness. The next contains the history of the first three dynasties, commencing with an account of Yaou and Shun, in the traditionary period, and describes the principal events of antiquity down to B. C. 1120. The last is an account of the life and times of Confucius, written by himself, and having been commenced in spring and concluded in autumn, was called 'Spring and Autumn.' Of the 'Four Books,' the first two, 'The Happy Medium,' and 'The Great Doctrine,' or, 'Study of Grown Persons,' were written by Tsze-sze, the grandson and disciple of Confucius. The third, called the 'Book of Discourses,' is the production of the disciples of the sage, who recollected and recorded his words and deeds. Mr. Davis remarks of this, that it is in all respects a complete Chinese *Boswell*; exhibiting the same submissive reverence towards the great master of letters and morals, and the same self-devotion in erecting the fabric of his greatness; and preserving the conversational style throughout. The pupils of the sage have recorded many of his opinions, as they occurred in private conversation. The following specimen may show the minuteness with which these are detailed: *Sentence* 6th. "In eating he did not omit ginger." *Comment*. "Ginger enlivens a man and dispels bad humours; the sage, therefore, did not neglect it." Whatever was said or done by him, is made a rule of action at the present day, even to his personal

demeanour. The last was written by Mencius, the disciple of Tsze-sze, and bears the name of its author.

These works constitute the class books in Chinese schools, and the ground work of the literary examinations. The first business of the student is, to commit the whole of them to memory. The text of the nine works is equal in bulk to that of the New Testament; and, says Mr. M., it is not hazarding too much to say, that were every copy annihilated to-day, there are a million of people who could restore the whole to-morrow. A large number of commentaries on them have been written, the most celebrated of which is that of Choo-foo-tsze, who flourished in the twelfth century. This is also committed to memory by the student, and his mind must be familiar with all others.

In addition to these, there are other works of high antiquity and great estimation, numerous philosophical writings, and multitudes of books in the various departments of learning. Their very voluminous works on history are dry and uninteresting, consisting mostly of barren annals, void of any trains of reasoning and lessons of political philosophy. Poetical compositions, also, are numerous; and romances, novels, and dramatic writings actually deluge the land. The Chinese are extremely fond of sententious, pithy sayings, or aphorisms. Mr. Davis has given a collection of these, which in no small degree illustrate the character, condition, and genius of the people.

The tenets of the Confucian school, as will be seen by any one who examines them, are evidently atheistical. Indeed the sage is rather to be considered as the author of a system of moral and political philosophy, than the founder of a religion. A consideration of this subject would afford interesting matter for several pages.

The sect of Taou, founded by Laou-tsze, who was cotemporary with Confucius, resembles, in some respects, the Epicureans, affecting to despise riches and honours, and all worldly distinctions, and to aim at subduing every passion that can interfere with personal tranquillity and self-enjoyment. As death, however, was something that they could not pretend to despise, they have attempted to invent an elixir of long life, or immortality, and have thus become alchemists. The science of magic has also occupied them at different times, and at one period gained so much credit with the sovereigns of the country that the title of 'Celestial doctors' was conferred on its professors. This is now by far

the least popular or predominant sect of China, only a few of the most ignorant being engaged with its superstitions. The other religion of China, as is well known, is that of Buddha, which was introduced into the empire about sixty-five years after the Christian era. The empire is full of Buddhist temples, and the priests actually swarm. These live in indolence and ignorance, and are treated with the utmost scorn by the literati of China.

We are unwilling to close without alluding to the efforts that have been made for introducing the gospel into China. It is evident that some knowledge of Christianity was communicated to this empire at a very early age. The apostle Thomas, who is denominated 'the apostle to the Hindoos and Chinese,' in the epitome of the Syrian canons, is believed to have preached the gospel in Peking. It is also evident that the Syrian churches made efforts in the seventh century to propagate the Nestorian creed among this people. No very successful attempts, however, for the conversion of the Chinese, appear to have been made until the middle of the sixteenth century, when the Jesuit fathers commenced their zealous and indefatigable efforts. With the character and labours of Francis Xavier the reader of ecclesiastical history is acquainted. In 1579, M. Rogier, an Italian Jesuit, arrived in China, where he was soon joined by Matthew Ricci. The latter, by his talents and knowledge of the sciences, rapidly gained influence, and was at length received and honoured at court, and taken into the service of the state. He was no sooner settled than he began to diffuse his doctrines; and in a few years succeeded in converting a number of persons of distinction. Several devoted brethren joined him not long after, whom he established at various stations. His death occurred in 1610.

The mission continued to be patronized until the year 1615, when a persecution was raised, and some of the missionaries were beaten, others imprisoned, and those at court compelled to retire to Macao. It was not long, however, before they were recalled, and permitted to continue their labours. In 1628, Adam Schaal found his way to the court, and by his skill in the mathematics, gained a fame equal to that of Ricci. Soon after this, the Dominicans and Franciscans entered China, and took their share with the Jesuits in their arduous labours. When the Tartars came in possession of the empire, Schaal retained his place at court, and stood high in the favour of the Tartar-Chinese monarch, who ap-

pointed him superintendent of the astronomical board, and conferred on him many marks of approbation. Verbiest soon became his coadjutor in presiding over the tribunal of mathematics. The emperor frequently entered into conversation with them on the subject of religion, read the Christian books, and admired the morality of the gospel.

In 1665, some false reports respecting the missionaries having been raised and published, they were arrested, deprived of their churches, and some banished. In 1671, they were again put in possession of their churches, but were prohibited from making converts among the natives. Notwithstanding this interdict, however, they baptized in that year twenty thousand Chinese. The emperor, Kanghy, studied the elements of Euclid under Verbiest, and learned from him the doctrines of Christianity. The learned and devoted Verbiest died in 1688, lamented by the Chinese, and especially by his fellow-labourers.

Encouraged by the openings which presented themselves, Louis XIV. king of France, resolved to send a mission to China; and having selected a number of Jesuits, well skilled in the mathematics, he sent them with honours and pensions on this important mission. Among these were Gerbillon, Bouvet, and Le Compte, afterwards celebrated for their labours in the east. These were soon followed by large numbers of others.

The affairs of the mission seemed now to be in a prosperous condition, and its prospects very favourable. But the work was soon most unhappily interrupted by those disputes among the missionaries which eventually brought on them the frowns and persecution of the government, and the defeat of their whole enterprise. A detailed account of the occurrences alluded to would lead us beyond our proper limits. The very last of the Roman Catholic missionaries has been expelled from Peking, and a decided hostility to the Romish religion has been manifested by the present monarch. However much the indiscretion of these later missionaries is to be censured, any one who reads the history of the earlier ones, cannot but venerate their piety, learning, and ardent devotion to their work.

The pious and self-denying Dr. Morrison, as is well known, went as the first Protestant missionary to China, early in the present century. A history of his labours, and of all missionary operations in reference to that empire, will be found in the latter part of Mr. Medhurst's volume, together with

an account of the present state and prospects of the Chinese mission. For more particular information on many of the subjects at which we have glanced, and on many more which we have not been able to name, we cheerfully refer our readers to this work; devoutly hoping that the evangelical spirit for which it is characterized may be imbibed by its readers.

ART. II.—*Claims of the Gospel Ministry to an Adequate Support. An address of the Presbytery of Elizabethtown to the Churches under its care.* Elizabethtown: Edward Sanderson. 1838. pp. 23.

As the name of the Rev. David Magie stands at the head of the committee by which this address was prepared, we presume the churches are indebted to his pen for this excellent communication. After a few remarks upon the delicacy of the subject, and the consequent indisposition of ministers to enforce it upon their people, the committee proceed to consider first the equitable claims of the ministry to an adequate support; secondly, the doctrine of the scriptures upon the subject; thirdly, the advantages to the people themselves resulting from having a ministry adequately supported; fourthly, the obligation which rests upon the people to render this support, in virtue of their contract with their pastors. These several topics are illustrated with clearness, force and solemnity.

The churches have long been disquieted by the discussion of many questions theoretical and practical; but it may fairly be doubted whether there is one of equal importance with that which forms the topic of this address. It is not merely in our day, or in our country, that the support of the ministry has been a matter of difficulty. Ever since the introduction of Christianity it has, in one form or another, and to a greater or less degree, been beset with embarrassments. The apostles found it necessary repeatedly and urgently to enforce the duty upon their hearers. And when there has been no denial of the duty, there has been much diversity of opinion as to the best method of accomplishing the object. Before the time of Constantine all contributions for this purpose were perfectly voluntary.

In Jerusalem, indeed, among the early converts, there was a community of goods, 'All that believed were together and had all things common. And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all as every man had need.' In a subsequent passage it is said, that the owners of these possessions brought the prices of the things that were sold and laid them down at the apostles' feet. The apostles, however, soon found that the duty of making distribution of this common stock, was both burdensome and invidious. They therefore said to the people, 'It is not reason that we should leave the word of God to serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.' This was the origin of the office of deacons. It is obvious that the apostles never designed to make the plan of having a community of goods, the common law of the church. It was confined to Jerusalem. That they countenanced it there, but never recommended or introduced it elsewhere, must be accounted for, from some peculiarity in the circumstances of the Christians in that city. They were constantly exposed to persecution, and in danger of being driven away from their possessions. The city itself was devoted to destruction. No one knew when the hour would come when those who were upon the house top, would have to escape, without taking any thing away. Under these, and other circumstances of which we are ignorant, the apostles saw it to be wise that the ties of property at least in the city which had slain their master should be severed, and the whole church be like an encamped army, waiting the command to march.

Whatever may have been the peculiar circumstances of the church at Jerusalem, which made a community of goods desirable, the appointment of deacons to which that community at first gave occasion, was found important in other churches. Hence they were generally introduced. Every where there were poor to be relieved and funds distributed. It is probable that for a long time the support of pastors was provided for out of the common stock arising from the voluntary contributions of the people, and placed at the disposal of the deacons. As the churches multiplied and became more settled, these contributions were rendered more systematic. It appears from the early writers that they were for the most part, in kind, consisting principally of the first fruits, and of what each man gained in his ordinary occupa-

tion. There is evidence however, that besides these general gifts, there was, as early as the beginning of the third century, a regular monthly contribution, in money, appropriated especially to the support of the clergy. In the fourth, and perhaps during the third century, the rule was generally adopted of dividing all oblations into three portions; one for the bishop, one for the other church officers, and one for the poor. The distribution of these means of support was for a long time in the hands of the deacons and elders. It was also customary for the people to make contribution at baptisms, marriages, and other occasions of special religious service. All these however were voluntary. To give for the support of the church was urged on the people, indeed, as a reasonable duty and one of divine appointment, but which like other duties of the same class, was left to be the dictate of every man's conscience. *Modicam unusquisque stipem, says Tertullian, menstrua die, vel cum velit, et si modo possit, apponit; nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte offert.*

It was thus that the ministry was supported for three hundred years. During this period it had extended itself to the extremities of the Roman empire, pervading all ranks, and attaining such an influence as to make the conversion of Constantine a matter of policy, if it had not been the result of conviction. As soon as the emperor became a Christian, a different arrangement was made for the support of the clergy. They had no doubt often struggled with difficulties under the old system, and very naturally supposed, it would be a relief to them and their people to be placed above the necessity of depending on voluntary contributions. It is not wonderful therefore that they availed themselves of the zeal and liberality of Constantine. The emperor ordered a certain portion of the income of each province to be assigned to the support of the church; in many instances, he gave to the church the property of the neighbouring heathen temples. Thus the temple of the Sun in Egypt was given with all its treasures, property and income to the church of Alexandria. And finally he authorized the church to receive and hold whatever legacies might be bequeathed to it. In that age of general ignorance and of increasing ambition among the clergy, this last provision became the most copious source of wealth. It was soon a matter of common consent, that no Christian was to make a will without remembering the church. And, it is said that within fifty years

after the passage of the law just mentioned, the clergy were in possession of one tenth of the real estate in almost every province. And before a century had elapsed, the state had to interfere to check the progress of the evil. The better portion of the clergy disapproved of, and lamented the rapacity of their brethren, and endeavoured to discourage the lavish and unjust bequests of their people. *Quicumque vult, says Augustine, exhaereditato filio haeredem facere ecclesiam, quaerat alterum, qui suscipiat, non Augustinum. Immo Deo propitio, neminem inveniet.*

The administration of the property of the church, was almost entirely in the hands of the bishops. The old three-fold division was still enforced; but as it rested with the bishop to apportion the part belonging to the presbyters, giving to one more and to another less, it was but a small check on their power. Bishops were, indeed, in the fourth and fifth centuries, very inconsiderable in power, except those in large and wealthy cities. All the pastors of village churches, when not in immediate dependance on a neighbouring city church, were called bishops, and recognised as such by their richer brethren. Hence we find hundreds of bishops enumerated as belonging to certain districts of North Africa; the far greater portion of whom, were, no doubt, mere village pastors. The power of those more advantageously situated, however, constantly increased, and one of the principal means of its advancement was the control which they had obtained over the property of the church. In the fifth century, however, parishes came to retain for their own use, at least in many cases, the ecclesiastical income arising within their bounds, instead of paying it into common fund to be apportioned by the bishop, and in the sixth century no church could be built without being endowed with a certain portion of land.

From Constantine to Charlemagne the church was supported mainly by its own increasing property, and the still continuing oblations for special services. A great change was introduced by the latter prince. It had often been taught by the clergy, at an earlier period, that the tenth of the incomes of the Christians should be devoted to the service of the church; but they had never been able to introduce the payment of tithes among the people. This could only be done by the civil power. Charlemagne was induced, in 779, to make an edict, requiring this payment from all laymen, and subjecting even the property of the crown to

the same burden. It required all his authority and that of his successors, aided by the influence of the clergy, to enforce this heavy imposition. It was however at length effected, and remains to the present day, in many parts of Europe, one of the principal sources of ecclesiastical wealth. This great accession of riches, rendered the acquisition of more an easier task than ever. The church consequently rapidly advanced in wealth, by bequests, by purchases, (especially during the period of the crusades, when European estates were freely bartered for a small amount of ready money, which it was hoped would enable the adventurers to secure principedoms and earldoms in the east), and by the rise in the value of property. Prelates thus became princes, having nobles of the highest rank among their vassals. How far this accumulation of wealth in the hands of the clergy, in that age of violence, was a benefit to European civilization, is a question of difficult solution. God brought good out of the evil, and certainly rendered these riches more effectual to the promotion of the best interests of society, than they would have been in the hands of marauding barons. It is to this source that Europe is indebted for almost all her hospitals and universities. Its immediate influence on religion, however, was of course disastrous.

At the time of the reformation this immense wealth in a great measure reverted to the state, and was distributed among rapacious nobles. All protestant churches therefore have been poor. The only exception to this remark, is the church of England, which contrived to save enough of the property of her elder sister, to make her, by the wonderful increase in its value, one of the richest churches in the world. She has retained too the right to the tenth of all agricultural productions, and imposes with undeviating exactness the payment of fees for the administration of the rites of baptism, marriage, and burial.

The church of Scotland is poor; her ministry is supported by the heretors in the several parishes, who, holding property formerly subject to tithes, are required to pay a certain portion to the minister. If this portion be inadequate, it may upon application to the court of sessions be increased, until the teends or tithes are exhausted. In France the revolution ingulphed all ecclesiastical property. The clergy there are supported by the state; and provision for the church is as regular a part of the annual budget as provision for the army. In our own country various systems have been tried. Be-

fore the revolutionary war the episcopal church was established in several of the provinces. In Virginia, for example, the law provided that every minister should have a salary of 16,000 lbs. of Tobacco, to be assessed by the vestry, who had power to distrain the property of those who refused payment. Besides this salary, every pastor was to be furnished with a house and two hundred acres of land. In South Carolina, when there was but one Episcopal church in the province and four belonging to the dissenters, the church of England was established by law, and provision made for the building and endowment of churches and support of the clergy, at the public expense. And, what was far more objectionable, no one not in connexion with that church was eligible to the legislature. In several other of the American provinces, similar measures were adopted for the establishment and maintainance of the church of England. All these laws were swept away by the revolution. The consequence was that the Episcopal church immediately declined. Not being accustomed to stand by itself, as soon as foreign support was withdrawn, it fell. And it was long before its members roused themselves to do what other protestant denominations had been accustomed to do from the beginning.

In New England at an early period provision was made by law for the support of the clergy; and assessments were made and collected for this purpose in the several towns as for other objects. These laws survived until comparatively a recent period, but have at last given way to the force of public opinion. The church, therefore, in America, of all denominations, now rests for support on the voluntary contributions of its members. It is thus thrown back to the condition of the primitive church during the first three centuries. We are accustomed to speak much of the great experiment of civil liberty which is now in progress in our country, as one in which the interests of mankind are deeply involved. This may be true; but the greatest experiment relates to the self-sustaining power of the church. This is the first extended trial of this question which has been made for fifteen hundred years. The belief of the necessity of aid from the state had, during this extended period, become almost universal. Hence predictions of the failure of the experiment are constant and confident. We have no fears for the ultimate result. Believing the gospel to be of God, and the church to be a divinely appointed institution against which the gates of hell never can prevail, we doubt not that

they can sustain themselves, or rather that they will be sustained by their divine author, not only without the aid, but in despite of all the opposition of the world. The experiment, though somewhat differently modified in the present case, is not new. The church for three hundred years, so far from being supported, was opposed and persecuted by the state. Yet it not only lived, but spread more rapidly and extensively than during any equal period from that time to this. The Catholic church in Ireland has sustained itself for nearly three centuries, in despite of the frowns of the government, and in the presence of a rival and established institution. The Dissenters in England, though in many instances burdened with the payment of church rates, and of tithes for the support of the establishment, have yet lived and multiplied until they constitute a large proportion of the people. In our country, with regard to most denominations, from the beginning, and with regard to all, of late years, the same thing may be said. They have continued and extended themselves with ever increasing vigour. It is a matter for devout gratitude, that while the church has had to make provision not merely for her own increasing children, but for the hundreds of thousands who are constantly arriving from foreign countries, she has in a good measure come up to the greatness of her task. The unportioned church of America has made as competent provision for the population of this country, at least where the settlements are thirty years old, as the church of England, with all her vast endowments, has made for the people of England. There is as much complaint there, as here, of the want of church accommodation, and religious instruction. There is therefore no ground for despondency. The promise of God stands sure. His church shall not die. It is the salt and light of the world. That salt will not lose its savour; nor that light its brightness, until the whole world is imbued with the grace, and illumined with the glory of the Lord.

Though there is every reason to entertain this confidence in the continuance and increasing influence of the church of God, it is not to be concealed or forgotten that our enjoyment of its blessings, and the transmission of them to our descendants depends, under God, upon our own exertions. Scripture and history abundantly teach us that though the church be imperishable, the church privileges and blessings of a particular people are suspended on their fidelity. The church did not cease to exist, when the Jews, for their

unbelief, were cast out, and the Gentiles introduced; nor did the decline of the churches of Asia prevent the introduction and spread of the gospel in other parts of the world. Christ's threat to the unfaithful is not that he will extinguish the light, but that he will remove the candle-stick out of its place. A glance at the condition of those countries upon which this denunciation has fallen, is enough to fill us with horror at the thought that this woe may light on us and upon our children. What is written, is written for our admonition. What has happened to others, will happen also to us, unless we are faithful. All that is dear in our civil and social privileges; all that is precious in the consolation and light of religion; all that is valuable in reference to the soul, is intimately involved in the maintenance of the gospel. We may think of this method of saving men, and of promoting the best interests of society as the ancient Greeks did, who esteemed it foolishness; but it is none the less the wisdom and power of God.

God then has imposed a weighty responsibility on the Christians of this country. They must support the gospel, or it will not be supported. The ways of Zion will mourn. Souls will perish for lack of vision; and our children will grow up ignorant of God, and fitted for destruction. We have no church property; no government patronage; no tithes or taxes. Every thing depends on the free will offerings of the people. This, we believe, is the foundation on which God appointed the support of the ministry to rest. We find in the New Testament no intimation that the church ought to seek the riches of this world; no appeals on this subject to any thing but the sense of duty in Christians; no reference to the obligation of magistrates to assume this burden. It rests with believers. And we are contented to leave it where Christ and his apostles have placed it. As this is a duty which is so clearly enjoined in the scriptures, and as it is one on the right discharge of which such important interests are dependent, it is obviously a fault, on the part of public teachers, that it is so seldom presented and urged. The apostles did not allow a false delicacy, or a dread of misconstruction, to prevent them from being frequent and explicit in their statements on this subject. The man whose motives are really good need not be, and he seldom is, afraid of having them misconceived. It is when our own hearts accuse us, that we are afraid others will suspect us.

Besides such cursory, though pointed, declaration of the duty of Christians to provide for the support of the ministry, as are to be found in Luke 10: 7. Gal. 6: 6. 1st. Tim. 5: 18, we have, what is of rare occurrence in the scriptures, in reference to a matter of duty, an extended and regular argument to enforce the obligation. Paul having asserted, in 1 Cor. 9, the right (*ἐξουσίαν*) of minister to be supported, proceeds to sustain that right by several distinct considerations. His first argument is founded upon the principle that labour ought to be rewarded; or, as our Saviour has expressed it, that the labourer is worthy of his hire. This principle is recognised in all the departments of life; and society could not exist without its faithful observance. Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? We do not expect men to devote their time and talents, and to risk their lives in our service or defence at their own expense. We do not demand this of them as something just or reasonable. We feel that it would be dishonest to make any such demand; and that it could never, except in rare instances, be complied with, if it were made. The world over, therefore, and in every age of the world, soldiers have been supported by those for whom they served. If this be so with regard to the soldiers of this world; is there any reason why those who are called to wage a much harder warfare; to contend against sin, and ignorance, and error; who devote their time, talents and life to this service, should be excluded from the benefit of the principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire? It may be said, that there are other and higher motives than that of an earthly recompense, which ought to influence men in this spiritual warfare. Certainly. We are not speaking of the motive to engage in this service, but of the right to a support from those for whose benefit the service is rendered. No man ought to be a soldier for the sake of a support. His motives should be a desire to protect the innocent, to defend the weak, to maintain the cause of justice, and liberty and right; and to do the will of God. His obligation to act from such motives, however, does not interfere with his right to be sustained. In like manner the man is to be pitied, if not despised, who enters the ministry for a support; who is dead to the motives springing from the worth of souls, the love of Christ, the glory of God; who can not say that there is a necessity laid upon me, yea woe is unto me if

I preach not the gospel. Yet even Paul, with all his lofty zeal, and purity of motive, did not feel that his having good motives impaired his right to be supported by those who were benefited by his labours, or that his assertion of this right gave any just occasion to call his disinterestedness in question. In some cases indeed he refused to avail himself of his right. From the captious, censorious and divided Corinthians, he would receive nothing. And in Thessalonica he wrought with labour and travail night and day, that he might not be chargeable to any of them. But of his beloved Philippian he freely accepted what they once and again sent, even when he was in Thessalonica, and afterwards, when he was in Rome, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing unto God.

It is not however merely to such cases as that of soldiers that the principle in question is applied. It has a far wider scope: for who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock? That is, to whatever lawful occupation a man devotes his labour, he is entitled to enjoy the fruits of it. The tenure by which men, since the fall, hold the world is, that in the sweat of the face they shall eat bread. If a man, therefore, labours, he is entitled to live. It is easy to see how soon and how completely society would be disorganized, if this rule were not adhered to; if the farmer should be forbidden to reap the harvest which he had raised; or if in any department of life, labour should not be rewarded. Not only would the motive to exertion be destroyed, but the possibility of its continuance would be taken out of the way. If a man labours for himself, he looks for his reward to the profits of his occupation; if he labours for others, he has a right to look to others for a return. Men of course are not slow to see the justice and necessity of this arrangement, in all the ordinary affairs of life. No one expects another to till his farm, to keep his accounts, to plead his cause, for nothing. Nor does he imagine that because higher motives than a desire to gain a livelihood, may govern those who render these services, that their claim to a recompense is thereby destroyed.

The principle that labour should be rewarded, has a far higher sanction than mere human customs. The word of God enforces it even in its application to brutes. For it is written thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. Does God take care of oxen? or sayeth he it alto-

gether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written. That is, the design of that precept is not so much to secure the kind treatment of oxen, as to impress upon men the general duty of rewarding labour. If enforced even in reference to irrational creatures, and the lowest services, how much more obviously is it binding in relation to men, and to the most important services? This then is a duty enforced not merely by the general principles of equity, and the customs of men, but by the authority of the word of God. No man has a right to enjoy the labours even of a brute without a compensation.

The apostle's second argument is founded on the principles of reciprocal justice. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? Spiritual things are things relating to the soul; carnal things are things relating to the body. If one kind of benefits is bestowed by the ministers of the gospel, is it unreasonable that they should partake of another kind? And if the benefits bestowed are of infinitely greater value than those received, is not the case so much the stronger? What then are the benefits resulting to a people from the ministry of the gospel? What do the scriptures and experience teach upon this subject? The bible tells us that it has pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. How shall they believe, except they hear? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? So faith cometh by hearing. Strange as it may seem, God has made the public preaching of the gospel the great means of salvation. And, beyond all doubt, the great body of those who, in every age, have obtained eternal life, or shall hereafter attain it, have been, or are to be indebted to the preaching of the gospel for their salvation. If this be so; then is the value of this divine institution beyond all estimate. Let those who feel the worth of their own souls, or of the souls of others, ask what is to be placed in competition with them; or which of their possessions they would retain at the expense of the preached word? Surely it must be left to the indifferent and to the infidel, to undervalue an institution, which by divine appointment, is the common channel for communicating salvation.

Though this be the paramount design, and distinguishing value of the ministry, it is not the only good that flows from it. The progress of piety in believers; the excitation of devout feelings, which is not a mere transient good, but of per-

manent effect on the character; the confirmation of correct principles; the maintainance of divine knowledge; the elevation of the moral tone of society, are all intimately connected with the pulpit. Certain it is, that the gospel has never yet been conveyed to any people, nor sustained among them, except by the ministrations of the living teachers. All the religious, moral and social blessings therefore connected with the gospel of the Son of God, are, by divine appointment, mainly dependent on the faithful preaching of the word. Look at those countries where the priests' lips have failed to keep knowledge; or where there are no sanctuaries and no public proclamation of the gospel. There are moral desolations; there is superstition or infidelity; there violence, and rapin, and all uncleanness. Look again at those places blessed with an humble and faithful ministry; there is the garden of God; there are order, and justice, and religion, and all that makes earth a fit preparation for heaven. Such are the benefits which, in a greater or less degree, the clergy are the means of conveying to the people. They are indeed but earthen vessels; but still vessels which God has ordained to be the channels of conveying the treasures of his love. What then do the clergy expect in return for these benefits? Simply that they be enabled to discharge their appropriate duties; that instead of being distracted or absorbed by the cares of this world, they may be left free to obey that command of God which requires them to give themselves wholly to these things. It is not riches, nor honour, nor power that they claim. For such a claim they have no warrant in the Scriptures. But to be supported, without the necessity of engaging in wordly avocations, they have a claim, founded in the plainest principles of justice, and sanctioned by the word of God.

Again the apostle appeals in support of his position to the usage of all nations on this subject. Do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things live of the temple? and that they which wait at the altar are partakers of the altar? This perhaps refers principally to the institutions under the Old Testament dispensation. God had ordered that the priests and Levites should not only receive the tenth of all the productions of the fields, but also a portion of the various oblations presented at the temple. Though this rule was by God himself established under the Mosaic economy, it was by no means peculiar to the Jewish polity. All nations have felt the necessity of religion, they have seen that for the main-

tainance and spread of religion, a set of men must be devoted to its services, and that they must be supported while in the discharge of their duties. It is therefore a fact, that those who minister at the altar partake of the altar.

The apostle's last argument is the most decisive of all. The Lord hath ordained that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. From this decision there can be no appeal. The religion we profess, is the religion of Christ. The church we enter, is the church of Christ. If we enter it at all, we must enter it upon the terms which he has prescribed. If we embrace his religion, we must embrace the whole of it. We cannot receive some of his doctrines and reject others; we cannot obey some of his precepts and refuse obedience to others. If he has ordained that the ministers of the gospel should live by the gospel, it is as much the duty of his people to regard his will in this point, as in any other.

Christians, therefore, should feel that the support of the ministry is a duty, in itself reasonable, and especially enjoined by Christ; a duty, which they cannot neglect without sinning against those principles of justice which are the only security of their own wealth, and without disobeying their divine master. His commands are not grievous. For in the first place the thing enjoined is not burdensome. He does not require his people to impoverish themselves to enrich their pastors, but merely to support them; to support them in such a way that they may be able to devote themselves to their work, and discharge their various duties to his acceptance. The question what is a support? admits of no definite answer. What is adequate for this purpose in one place is entirely insufficient in another; what is sufficient for a day-labourer, would be very inadequate for a man of education, that is, it would be insufficient to enable such a man to discharge his appropriate duties. As Christ requires such qualifications in his ministers as renders it necessary for them to be educated men, in requiring his people to support them, he requires them to do it in such a manner as shall enable them to discharge the duties pertaining to the class to which they belong.

In the second place, this command is not grievous, because it is designed for the benefit of the people themselves. The end of the ministry is the edification of the body of Christ. They exist for the people, and not the people for them. They are the servants of Christ, and for Christ's sake, the servants of the church. And it is for the interest of the church that her servants should be devoted to their work,

and not distracted by other avocations. It is almost the inevitable consequence of the inadequate support of the clergy, that they should become worldly men. What can they do? They must live. If the people do not support them, they must support themselves. Hence one becomes a teacher, another a farmer, another a speculator. It is the people that, in the great majority of cases, drive the ministers to those expedients. This is evident from the fact that it is rare to see them resorted to except where the salaries are insufficient to sustain and educate a family. It is a matter for thankfulness that those ministers, who, not having the excuse of inadequate support, from mere love of money, engage in worldly pursuits, are pointed at by the world as mercenary men, and mourned over by the pious as bringing a reproach upon their profession, and a disgrace upon religion. This shows that public sentiment is not yet entirely perverted on this subject; that it is felt to be inconsistent with the sacred office that ministers should be greedy of filthy lucre; or have their attention diverted from their appropriate work for the sake of making money. With regard to this class there is little diversity of opinion. It is not of them, however, that we are now called to speak. There is another and much larger class, who are more or less engaged in worldly business, who have been forced into this course, from the incompetency of their salaries. The blame, therefore, whatever it be, must rest mainly on those who create the necessity of their pastors being distracted by worldly cares and avocations. It is those who refuse an adequate support to the ministry who are in a great measure responsible for this evil. In the days of Nehemiah we find the same cause producing the same effect. 'I perceived that the portions of the Levites had not been given them; for the Levites and the singers who did the work were fled every one to his field. Then contended I with the rulers, and said why is the house of God forsaken? And I gathered them together and set them (the Levites) in their places. Then brought all Judah the tithe of the corn, and the new wine, and the oil, unto the treasuries.' It was because the portion due to the Levites, was not given them, that they fled every one to his field. The great reformer in Israel corrected the evil of a worldly priesthood by contending with the people, and inducing them to support the ministers of religion. Surely the people in our day, and in our country, have no right to complain that their pastors give so much of their time to wordly affairs, while they refuse to sustain them.

Let them take away the excuse and occasion for this evil, and then will they have a right to demand the entire time and attention of those who labour in word and doctrine.

Few perhaps are sufficiently sensible of the magnitude of the evils which result from ministers being so much engaged in secular concerns. Ministers are of like passions with other men. Their characters are influenced or formed by their circumstances, as is the case with others. They cannot take coals into their bosom without being burned. If forced to be men of business, they will have more or less of the character of secular men. Gain will become to them a definite object of pursuit. Success will increase the disposition to acquire; and they will gradually become more interested in their agricultural or commercial enterprises than in their ministry. Their peculiar official duties are secondary objects. The Sabbath is given to preaching; the week to worldly business. How often matters reach this extremity, we are not prepared to say. But such is the tendency. It would be little short of a miracle if, as a general rule, a set of men, who are obliged to devote the greater part of their time to secular business, should retain their spirituality and devotedness as ministers of the gospel. If their whole object in labouring, was to obtain means to preach the gospel, as was the case with Paul, they would doubtless like Paul keep the world and its concerns entirely subordinate in their affections and attention to their great work. But every one knows how easy and gradual is the transition from one state of mind to another. When a minister once sets himself to make money, he must be an extraordinary man, or have an extraordinary measure of grace, if he keep himself within the strict limit of supporting himself and family; and if he continues to labour not for gain, but that he may preach the gospel. Why should the feet of ministers be placed on such a slippery declivity, where so few have been able to retain their standing? Why should the people force them to run a risk so perilous both to themselves and others? This is the way to train up a worldly ministry; a ministry more concerned about the things of this world, than the spiritual welfare of their people. It is not from selfish motives that the clergy need complain of their inadequate support. For one of the surest ways to make a clergyman rich, is to give him an insufficient salary. He is then thrown on his own resources. He commences teaching, or farming, or speculating. If an educated man, he has great advantage over his ordinary com-

petitors in these employments, and will be in general more successful. The rich ministers in this country are those who have poor salaries. The poor ministers are those whose people give them an adequate support. It is not therefore for the sake of the temporal interests of the clergy, that the duty of providing for their wants is urged upon the people. It is because it is contrary to all experience, contrary to the constitution of human nature, that men who are immersed in the business of the world should be faithful and efficient ministers of the gospel. The people are the greatest sufferers. If they are the means of making their pastor a secular man, no one can estimate the loss they sustain, in the character, even more than in the amount of his ministrations. They are apt to want that divine unction which is given to those who comply with the command of God to give themselves to reading, meditation and prayer. A mind anxious all the week about the price of grain, or lands, or of stocks, is not likely to be in tune for the sacred duties of the sanctuary. Besides this, the time which ought to be employed in his study or in pastoral duty, is necessarily devoted to secular business. The consequence is that the sermons of such men become monotonous, uninstructional and uninteresting. The people are fed with chaff, instead of fine wheat. The evil does not rest here. It spreads beyond the limits of the congregation. If it is the tendency of worldly pursuits to injure the spiritual devotion of the clergy, it must through them affect the interest of the whole church. They are the rulers of the church. They decide its action; they direct its energies. Unless they have the spirit of their Master, what is to be expected of the church over which they preside. Next to making the church so rich that it would allure unconverted men into its service, we know nothing more likely to lower its spirituality, and impair its usefulness more effectually, than to make such an inadequate support for its ministry, as to create a necessity or excuse for their engaging in secular pursuits. It lowers the tone of religion in the minds of the clergy; it lowers the intellectual character of their discourses; it interferes with their pastoral duties; and it prevents their compliance with the express requisitions of the Bible in relation to their office.

It is not sufficiently considered that a bishop or a pastor is required to be devoted to his work. Neglect not, says the apostle to Timothy, the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself

wholly to them: that thy profiting may appear unto all. The gift here spoken of was the office of the ministry, conferred by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. This office is frequently called a *grace* or gift, being bestowed by God for the edification of the church. It was this gift, with all its attendant graces, that Timothy was not to neglect. He was to meditate on these things; to give himself wholly to them. No man that warreth, says Paul, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier. How can a soldier in active service, be at the same time a merchant or a farmer? It is essential to his calling that it should be his whole work. Ministers are the soldiers of Jesus Christ. Their duties require their undivided attention. They cannot please him who has chosen them to this service, if they allow themselves to be entangled with the affairs of this life. This seems to be clearly the doctrine of the scriptures on this subject, as appears not only from particular commands, but also from the fact that the church is required to provide for the support of the ministry. Why should they be supported by others, if it was lawful for them to support themselves? If they may properly engage in secular pursuits, there is no necessity for any other provision for their maintainance. Accordingly we find that it has ever been considered as inconsistent with the nature of their office, that ministers should engage in secular pursuits. In the form prescribed in our Book of Discipline for a call to a pastor, it is clearly implied that he is to have nothing to do with such pursuits. 'That you may be free from worldly cares and avocations, we hereby promise and oblige ourselves to pay to you the sum of ——' On what assumption is that language founded? Does it not take for granted that a pastor should be free from worldly care and avocations? It is indeed too often a mockery. The people promise what they know, and what every one else knows, is entirely inadequate for the object for which it is given. And the fulfilment is often far behind the promise. Still the universality of the language shows that the opinion is universal, that when a man becomes a pastor, he should devote himself to his work, and not be under the necessity, nor have an excuse for engaging in secular business. The French protestants, in the pure age of their church, were even more explicit on this subject. The 19th canon, ch. 1, of their Book of Discipline is in these words: 'No minister, together with the holy ministry, shall be a practitioner in law or phy-

sic: yet out of charity he may give counsel and assistance to the poor of his flock and neighbourhood: provided always that he is not thereby diverted from his calling, nor derive any gain from his practice, unless in times of trouble and persecution, and when he cannot exercise his calling in the church, and be maintained by it. And those who thus employ themselves in law or physic, or in any other worldly distracting business, shall be exhorted wholly to forbear it, and totally to devote themselves unto the duties of their calling as ministers, and to the study of the scriptures. And all colloquies (i. e. presbyteries) and synods are admonished to proceed according to the canons of our discipline against the refractory, and such as be wilfully disobedient, as also against those who spend so much of their time in teaching youth, that it is a hinderance to them in the principal duties of their ministerial office. And all consistories, colloquies, and provincial synods, shall have a most special care and regard that this canon be punctually observed, and to suspend such as do transgress it from the exercise of the ministry.' This canon was not a dead letter, for we find repeated instances in the acts of the French synods of its being fully enforced. One of the earliest General Assemblies of the church of Scotland enacted 'That ministers given to unlawful and incompetent trades and occupations for filthy gain, as holding of hostleries, taking of usury besides conscience and good laws, bearing worldly offices in noblemen's and gentlemen's houses, and such like worldly occupations as may distract them from their charge, and may be slanderous to the pastoral calling, be admonished, and brought to an acknowledgement of their sins, and if continued, be deposed.'*

It admits of no question that, according to the general sentiment of the people of God in all ages, the pastoral office is inconsistent with engagements in worldly business. It matters little what that business may be; whether farming, merchandise, speculation, teaching, or book making; if undertaken for the sake of gain, or if it distract the attention from official duties, it comes within the prohibition. Some of these occupations are indeed more at variance with the nature of the ministry than others; and therefore are more likely to injure the man, and to disgrace religion. If a minister must make money, he had better do it as a teacher or an author, than as a stock-jobber, or land speculator. Still the difference is

* Calderwood's History of the Church of Scotland, p. 316.

merely circumstantial. He is bound, if possible, to be devoted to his work; and if he neglect this for the sake of gain he does wrong. If a man does not pretend to be a pastor, the case is altered. It may very well happen, that a minister may conscientiously believe that he can do more for the cause of Christ in some other department of labour. Here is no desertion of his calling; no neglect of official duty for the sake of gain. It may be, and very often is a disinterested sacrifice. It is the mere transfer of labour from one part of the vineyard to another. In all such cases it rests with the presbytery to decide upon the propriety of this transfer. There are some departments of education, which all churches, Catholic and Protestant, have always considered desirable should be entrusted to ministers, and therefore have not only allowed, but encouraged those who were called to such fields of labour, to enter upon them without reserve. On the other hand, the desertion of the active duties of the ministry, for the purpose of engaging in merely secular pursuits, has, by most churches, and by our own among the number, been visited with marked disapprobation. At a very early period of our history, a minister having for two or three years failed to attend synod, and neglected to discharge his ministerial duties, had his name struck from the roll. At a later period a clergyman of Long Island, being unable from ill health to preach, engaged in some worldly pursuit, this presbytery removed his name from their list of members. The synod indeed disapproved of that measure, and ordered his name to be restored, but with the injunction that the presbytery should attend to the case, and as soon as the health of the individual concerned would allow, require his return to the exercise of his ministry. This is a subject of great interest and importance, and calls loudly for attention from those who are interested for the welfare of the church; but it is not immediately connected with the present subject. We are not called upon by the pamphlet under review to consider what avocations are, and what are not inconsistent with the ministerial office. The Address relates to pastors. It brings to view the obvious duty of those whom the Holy Ghost has made overseers of the flock of Jesus Christ to devote themselves to their work; to feed his sheep and his lambs; to watch them by day and night; to prevent their wandering from his fold, or being destroyed by those who are constantly going about seeking whom they may devour. This is a work of awful responsibility and labour; requiring all the mind, all the

heart, all the time, and all the strength of those to whom it is committed. This is a duty which we have ventured to urge, not with a view of censuring our brethren, which is not our vocation, but for the purpose of expostulating with the people, who render the discharge of this duty, in many cases, impossible. It cannot be denied that throughout our land an alarming portion of the clergy are withdrawn from their appropriate duties, by the necessity of providing for their own support. Who are to blame for this? Those who create this necessity, or those who submit to it? The remedy of this evil, perhaps the greatest which now afflicts our church, can only be provided by the people. If they force their pastors to choose between working or starving, they must expect them to work, to engage in the business of the world, and more or less, alas! to imbibe its spirit; for to ministers, at least,

The world's infectious; few bring back at eve,
Immaculate, the manners of the morn.

But if they will support their pastors, they may hope to see them devoted to their duties; giving all their time and strength to the promotion of religion.

The inadequate support of ministers, besides its unavoidable tendency to cherish in them a worldly spirit and to force them to act contrary to the directions of the scriptures, necessarily lowers the standard of ministerial labours. How can a man, who is confined six days in the week to a school room discharge the full measure of pastoral duty? How can he who has a farm to cultivate, on which his support depends, be instant in season, out of season, reproving, rebuking and exhorting with all long suffering and doctrine? It is not wonderful that ministers thus situated should come to content themselves with one or two meagre discourses on the Sabbath; that the children and youth should be neglected, or left to the elders or the Sunday School; the sick and poor visited only in extremity, and the pastor sunk in the mere weekly preacher. Such results are almost unavoidable; and they are among the evils which are silently feeding on the life blood of the church. The people must awake to the importance of this subject, or it will be too late. No church can live without more culture than this. It will either perish, or fall into the hands of other and more assiduous labourers. Whether it be from this or from other causes, it cannot be denied that there has been a great decline in the standard of

ministerial labour throughout the country. When we read of the labours of the reformers and others of kindred spirit we are lost in wonder. We cannot understand how they accomplished or endured the half of what they effected or suffered. Luther preached almost daily; he lectured constantly as a professor; he was burdened with the care of all the churches; his correspondence, even as now extant, fills many volumes; he was perpetually harrassed with controversies with the enemies of the truth, and was one of the most voluminous writers of his day. The same, or even more might be said of Calvin. While in Strasburgh he preached or lectured every day. In a letter to Farel, dated from that city, he says that on one day he had revised twenty sheets of one of his works, lectured, preached, written four letters, reconciled several parties who were at variance, and answered more than ten persons who came to him for advice. In Geneva, he was pastor, professor, and almost magistrate. He lectured every other day; on alternate weeks, he preached daily; he was overwhelmed with letters from all parts of Europe; and was the author of works, (amounting to nine volumes folio,) which any man of our generation would think more than enough to occupy his whole time. And this amidst perpetual infirmity, headache, catarrh, strangury, gravel, stone, and gout. Baxter says of himself, that before the wars, he preached twice every Sabbath, and once in the week, besides occasional sermons, and several regular evening religious meetings. Two days in the week he catechised the people from house to house, spending an hour with each family. Besides all this he was forced, by the necessity of the people to practise physic; and as he never took a penny from any one, he was crowded with patients. In the midst of all these duties, though afflicted with almost all the diseases which man is heir to, he wrote more books than most of us can find time to read. All these men were poor. We find Luther begging the elector for a new coat, and thanking him for a piece of meat; Calvin selling his books to pay his rent; and Baxter was a curate with sixty pounds a year. It may be said that these were extraordinary men; raised up for extraordinary times. This is all true. And if we had such men now, we should have extraordinary times again. Such men form the time, as much as the time forms them. Though we must look up to such labourers as these with wonder and admiration, the distance between us and them need not be so deplorably great as it actually is. We may not be called

to write numerous folios, in the intervals of labour, but we have each his humble sphere in which if each were to labour with assiduity and singleness of purpose, we should soon see a new era in the condition of our church.

It is mentioned in the pamphlet before us that there are twenty one ministers in the presbytery of Elizabethtown, and with scarce a single exception, the work of the ministry is their only work. This is a most honourable distinction; but it is melancholy that it should be a distinction. What should be a matter of course, has become a matter for special gratulation. That these things should not be so, no one can doubt. What the church needs, more than any other outward blessing, is a ministry exclusively devoted to their work. And how it is to be obtained, unless the people will make such a provision for their pastors, that they may be free from worldly cares and avocations. To this they are bound by the principles of justice; by the ordinance of Christ; by a regard to their own spiritual interests, and the welfare of the church.

ART. III.—*The Scripture Guide: a Familiar Introduction to the Study of the Bible.* Prepared for the American Sunday School Union, and revised by the Committee of Publication. Philadelphia. pp. 263.

WE give the title of this unpretending little volume for two reasons. As it is written in the form of dialogues, and published for the use of Sunday Schools, it is likely to be overlooked or slighted by adults. And yet it contains a large amount of information, highly important even to ministers and students of theology, many of whom can scarcely be expected to derive it from the various, remote, and scattered sources, of which this writer seems to have availed himself. The volume gives a succinct account of the various bibliographical particulars belonging to the subject, and in relation to which we fear that not a few men of some learned pretension would be found deficient. In these matters are comprised the literary history of the Bible, its divisions and authorship, the means of its preservation and transmission, (including a full account of the ancient materials of writing, the appearance, value, &c. of manuscripts) notices of the

principal versions, with a more detailed history of the present English translation, its origin and execution, and a complete guide to the difficulties of the margin, double names of books, acrostics, untranslated and obsolete words, and other topics of obvious inquiry which would occur to an intelligent student. Much that is diffused through Horne and larger works is here condensed, and numerous items are collected which would have to be sought for in various and uncommon books, so that we believe the author speaks no more than the truth when he says that "there is not in our language any book which presents at one view exactly the field which is here exhibited." Our other reason for inviting attention to the book is this, that it tends, and is designed, to promote the critical, discriminating study of the English Bible. On the relation which this study ought to bear to that of the original Scriptures, we have some opinions of our own to express, and shall unceremoniously embrace this opportunity to state them in detail.

When the gospel was first preached, there was a language common to the civilized world, or at least to its improved and educated classes. That language was the Greek, and in that language the New Testament was written. The early Christian missionaries carried with them, therefore, the original gospel in a form accessible to multitudes scattered over the surface of the world then known. They carried with them likewise the Old Testament in the same language, translated, it is true, but in a very old translation, and one from which the writers of the New Testament habitually quote. Some knowledge of this version is consequently necessary to the full understanding of the New Testament, not only on account of the quotations just referred to, but because the idiom of the one is founded upon that of the other. Here then was a great advantage attending the original diffusion of the gospel. The preacher could put into the hands of the heathen the original New Testament and the most ancient version of the Old, in a language generally known throughout the Roman empire. These writings were not, it is true, composed in such a dialect or style, as to attract or satisfy the rhetorician; but they were written in a language vernacular to many readers, and more or less familiar to vast multitudes besides. This advantage has remained in the possession of the oriental church. It is still the boast of that communion, that the gospels and epistles have been read in her public service, from its first institution to the present day,

in the very tongue selected by the Holy Spirit as the vehicle of his communications, while the books of the Old Testament are publicly recited in a version made before the birth of Christ; a version disfigured, on the one hand, by innumerable errors and defects, but distinguished on the other, by its authority derived from age, and by the references to it, and the quotations from it, in the books of the New Testament. It is true that the Greek of the New Testament and the Septuagint is no longer the vulgar tongue of Greece; but it is also true, that the modern dialect is merely a corruption of the ancient language, and that much of the latter is of course intelligible to the modern Greek. It is true, moreover, that the preservation of the language, even so far as it has been preserved, is owing in a great degree to the possession and perpetual use of the Greek scriptures in the oriental church. Had this been wanting, the ancient tongue would have been overwhelmed by floods of barbaric innovation, and amidst the confusion of repeated revolutions, the very basis of the language might have undergone a change. But by continual repetition, the essential features of the Greek of the New Testament have been impressed too strongly, even on the vulgar mind, to be effaced or superseded by mere mixture or corruption. The vernacular Greek of our own day is as near to the Greek of the apostles as our English is to that of Chaucer or Wiclif. The same conservative influence on language has been exerted by the national versions of the Bible in German and in English, but with this advantage on the side of the Greeks, so far as the New Testament is concerned, that the standard writings which have thus preserved their language from extinction, are not a translation, but the ipsissima verba of the holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. While the oriental church continued, from age to age, to enjoy this great advantage, the western church at an early period, began to lose it. With them Greek was not a vernacular language, but, like the French in later times, the language of foreign travel and diplomatic intercourse, of politeness, erudition, and the fine arts. They soon, therefore, felt the need of a Latin version, and as the learning of the priests declined, the faith of western Christians became more and more dependent on the venerable Vulgate. Especially after the decline and downfall of the western empire, when political and literary intercourse between the east and west became less frequent, and the knowledge of Greek less indispensable to Latins, the ori-

ginal New Testament grew less and less familiar to the occidental priesthood. And this effect was heightened by the operation of collateral causes. The Christian ministry was gradually changed into a hierarchy, and engrossed with secular affairs. The powers of the clergy were no longer concentrated upon holy things, or if they were, it was to change the holy things themselves into a monstrous system of corruption and imposture. To sustain these unscriptural and unchristian innovations, the aid of tradition was invoked, first as a vassal, then as a consort, and finally as a sovereign or lord paramount of scripture. No wonder, therefore, that the latter was neglected, and the originals almost unknown. No wonder that, by slow degrees, the Vulgate version was practically substituted for the inspired Greek and Hebrew as a rule of faith. We say practically substituted, for although the change was, to all intents and purposes, effected early, it was not until after the close of the "dark ages," that the revolution was consummated in form. It was reserved for the Council of Trent, in the 16th century, to set the seal of ecclesiastical authentication on the version of a book in preference to the book itself. The effects of this revolution were of course disastrous. Even while it was as yet but partial and inchoate, it began to bring forth fruit which is to poison generations yet unborn. Besides the obvious sin and folly of setting the originals aside in favour of any version however perfect, there are momentous consequences springing from the imperfections of the versions used. To those who have not been in the habit of comparing translations with originals, it would not be easy to convey a just idea of the false impression which may be produced by a version scarcely open to objection in detail. Without insisting on the faint and feeble character of almost all translations, as compared with their originals, a difference not unlike that between copy and original in painting, it is a fact familiar to all scholars, that the proportions, texture, and complexion of a passage may be altered in a version, while the thoughts are all exhibited, and even the expressions very accurately copied. The explanation of this fact, from the influence of association on the reader's mind, may be waved as too familiar to require repetition. But when, in addition to this fault of the *ensemble*, this refracted view of the whole context as a whole, there are specific errors and defects in the translation, which obscure, or mutilate, or change its meaning, it is needless to observe that its effect upon a reader who

knows nothing of the original, must be a false impression, false in the general, and false, to a certain point, in its details. And this false impression, as it may be corrected by continual comparison with the original, may likewise, in default of such comparison, grow more and more remote from that original. That which is merely incidental in the latter may be rendered emphatic by unskilful version, while that which is really emphatic becomes secondary and obscure. And this false relation of the parts, by constant repetition, may grow more and more distorted and grotesque. A similar effect may be produced, but in another way. An unequivocal expression may be rendered by one more or less ambiguous. To many readers the inappropriate sense may first suggest itself, and thus become associated with the context. In this case, every repetition of the version, apart from the original, renders the association stronger and more natural, until at last it seems to be not only true but necessary. And yet the meaning thus connected with the text may be entirely foreign from its real import. With all these faults is the Latin Vulgate chargeable, and in all these ways it acted upon the religion and theology of the middle ages. How many Popish errors and corruptions may be more or less directly traced to the exclusive use of this translation of the Bible, is a curious question, into which we cannot, on this occasion, enter. What has already been suggested will suffice to show at least the possibility of such effects from such a cause. And with these considerations in our eye, we cannot wonder that at the first dawn of the Reformation, and before the great Reformers had appeared as authors, the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures were neglected, and the Vulgate version was the exclusive standard of the universal church. There are facts which would even seem to lead to the conclusion that the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures were forgotten, and their very existence unknown to the men by whom they should have been expounded. But how far this disgraceful depth of ignorance was common, cannot well be ascertained, especially as nearly all our knowledge of the fact is derived from the satirical and controversial writings which grew out of the revival of letters. Let us charitably hope that there were not many priests or monks, who could have thought that the Hebrew Bible was forged by Reuchlin and the Greek Testament by Luther.

At the Reformation a new era commences. That glorious revolution had its origin in the study of the Bible, and no

sooner did the reformers recognise the Scriptures as the exclusive rule of faith than they began to reinstate the inspired originals in their long-lost rights. An authentic statement of the influence exerted on the minds of the most eminent reformers by the study of the original Scriptures would be the most effectual refutation of the dogma, that all philosophical and critical study tends to unbelief and irreligion, as well as of the kindred error, that religious truth is to be discovered by the aid of metaphysics, independently of scripture. One thing is certain, as a matter of history, that the two giants of the Reformation, Martin Luther and John Calvin, spent a large part of their time and strength in simple exposition. And as a necessary part of exposition they translated anew from the original those portions which were to be expounded. Almost the first blow aimed at the corruptions of the church was the rejection of the Vulgate as "authentic" or inspired. And this was followed by new versions without number, more or less extensive. Luther, indeed, gained immortal honour by a complete translation of the Bible, a stupendous work considering the character and circumstances of the man. What should we think if one of our own agitators, spiritual gladiators, moral or immoral agents, moral, theological, or radical reformers, should produce a translation of one book of the Old Testament? Alas, we may congratulate ourselves when we can find these public benefactors even moderately versed in the vernacular contents of our own English Bible. From such look back to Luther, with an energy of character and warmth of temperament which might well have fitted him to lead a mob or head an army. Look at him, with his soul of fire, labouring at the composition, not of inflammatory pamphlets and reports, but of that imperishable work, which has identified his name with German literature, and from which the Germans date the rise of their fine language towards refinement and perfection. That Luther was the bona fide author of this version, may be read on every page of it, in thoughts that breathe and words that burn. There is perhaps no extensive version extant, which approaches so nearly to the freshness and vitality and warmth of an original. There is no other version of the Scriptures which, without attempting scrupulous adherence to the letter, represents, with such fidelity, the spirit of the Scriptures. It is plain that in translating Luther made the thoughts and languages of the sacred books his own, the consequence of which is that of-

ten when he seems to be most loose in the expression, he is most successful in embodying the very life and soul of his original. Though a hundred generations of philologists and critics should arise in Germany to re-translate the Bible, the nation would be false to their own honour and the cause of truth, if they should suffer one or all to supersede this noble monument of Luther's learning, skill, and zeal for God.

This bright example was soon followed. The Germans were not suffered to monopolize the honour of a national translation. Wherever the reformed religion was embraced, there was a hungering for the word of God. And at no remote period from the finishing of Luther's work, the Dutch, the Danes, the Swedes, the English, and the Protestants of France, had the whole Bible in their mother-tongues. A late biographer of Calvin expresses his regret that a French translation of the Scriptures was not executed by the great Reformer, who might then have shared the honours of his German fellow-worker in this as well as other things; and the two might have stood forth to posterity in this, as they now stand in so many other points of view, the Jachin and Boaz of the Reformation. The effect of such a version must have been immense, as the writer already cited well observes, not only on the Protestants of France, but on the language, taste, and intellect of that great nation. But these are vain regrets, and may especially be spared over the grave and amidst the memorials of such a man as Calvin. If he did less than Luther for bible translation, he did vastly more for doctrinal theology. *Non omnes possumus omnia.*

Among the national translations of the Bible, which the Reformation brought into existence, we have mentioned that of England. The history and character of this important version have, of late years, been favourite subjects both of investigation and discussion. Into this inquiry it is not our present purpose to enter. Instead of inquiring whence our version came, and wherein it excels, we rather wish to bring before the reader some of the effects which have resulted from its general adoption and continual use. Premising, then, that it is, by those most competent to judge, regarded as one of the best versions of the Bible, or of any other book, now extant, we would call attention to the fact, that when this version was, by common consent, taken as a national translation, for the benefit of all who speak the English tongue; when the zeal for original research and re-translation had been merged in general approbation of this common version; there was of

necessity a tendency, however slight, to the same evils which have been pointed out, as flowing, in the middle ages, from the exclusive use of the Latin Vulgate. The very excellence of the translation, while it gave the unlearned reader a desirable confidence in its correctness, tempted the clergyman and educated layman to rely upon it as an ultimate authority. And just in proportion as this faith grew strong, the disposition to examine the originals of course grew weak. The impulse given to the study of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures at the Reformation, by the novelty of the subject, its being a forbidden one, and the necessity of vindicating truth from official mutilation and infallible corruption, could not last, without fresh causes and occasions, through succeeding generations. When the general necessity for searching the originals came to an end, the study was soon limited to a few professional and zealous scholars, while the rest were glad to be relieved from the necessity of translating for themselves, by a translation which all sects and parties were agreed in thinking admirable. Here then was the foundation laid for just those evils which the sole use of the Vulgate had produced in other times, and still produces in the church of Rome. One grand distinction, it is true, existed in the far superior correctness of our version; so far superior, that in order to correct the evils flowing from its use, it is not requisite, as in the other case, to discard the version itself, especially as ours is in the vulgar tongue, but merely to correct the manner of its use. All this notwithstanding, the evils to be remedied, in their own nature, are the same in either case. There is the same tendency to indolent stagnation, resulting from a passive acquiescence in the common version, without the exciting and improving trouble of comparison and judgment. Nothing so effectually rouses and concentrates the attention in perusing a translation as the attempt to judge of its correctness for one's self, and the inertia resulting from the want of this excitement, not only impairs our knowledge of the Scriptures, but tends to produce a general paralysis of intellect and feeling. There is also, in both cases, the same tendency to misconceive ambiguous expressions, and to fasten on inadequate translations, to the detriment of gospel truth. Is it possible that some men, seated in high places, could have ventured to insist upon the language of our Bible, that "sin is the transgression of the law," in proof that sin consists in voluntary acts alone, if there had been such a general habit of comparing the original and ver-

sion even among clergymen, as to endanger the unfortunate discovery that ἀνομία means something more than actual transgression? It is true that the deception has been fully detected and exposed in controversy; but the original suggestio falsi, or at least suppressio veri, argues either profound ignorance in those who made it, or a supposition of profounder ignorance in those to whom it was addressed. Another effect, common to both cases, is the tendency to distort and falsify the context by false emphasis, by making that predominant which ought to be subordinate, and vice versa. Of this there are perpetual illustrations in the sermons of some admirable preachers, and even in their manner of reading the scriptures, a manner often of itself demonstrative, that the English Bible, and the English Bible only, is to them the word of God.

To convey a more definite idea of this error, we will give an illustration. Matthew Henry, in remarking on the 21st verse of the 24th chapter of Proverbs, says "He does not say, with *them that change*, for there may be cause to change for the better; but *that are given to change*, that affect it for change sake." Now it unfortunately happens that this pregnant and emphatic *given* belongs entirely to the English version; the original word is a participial form, and means *changers* or *those changing*. Particular illustrations might be multiplied; but we rather choose to point out a whole class of passages, in which the exclusive student of the English version is apt to betray his want of acquaintance with the original. We refer to those parts of Isaiah where the church is personified as the object of address. In exposition or quotation it is not uncommon to apply these passages to God himself, there being nothing in the form of the translation to prohibit such an application, though in Hebrew it is rendered impossible by the gender of the pronoun. We have known, for instance, these words—"the nation and kingdom, that will not serve thee, shall perish"—to be cited and explained as if the pronoun "thee" referred to God himself, whereas in Hebrew it is feminine, and determines the object of address to be the church. Another text which we have known to be thus misconceived, is Isaiah 41: 15—"Behold I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument *having teeth*"—where a slight inspection of the Hebrew text will show, that the pronoun "thee" is not masculine but feminine; so that the whole verse is addressed, not to the prophet, as the mere English reader might imagine, but to the

"worm Jacob" mentioned in the verse preceding, that is, to Israel, or the ancient church. A similar inspection of the Hebrew will detect another error also arising from the ambiguous version of this text. We have known preachers to explain it, or allude to it, even in print, as if "I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument" meant "I will make one for thee," whereas the original can only mean "I will make thee to become one." These are innocent mistakes, and in themselves not worth recital; but they serve to illustrate the particular sort of error into which we are apt to be betrayed by the exclusive use of versions. There are, however, errors far more serious, arising not from the mere ambiguity of our translation, but from its unauthorized additions to the text. To give a single example: in Acts 13: 33, the gratuitous insertion of the word "again" puts a false meaning not only on the sentence, but on the prophecy which is quoted in it, by making both refer to the resurrection, to which there is in fact no reference whatever in the thirty third verse. Against such unintentional perversions of the Scripture how can the mere English reader be upon his guard?

Another evil, produced by the same cause, is a tendency to lose sight of the nexus between passages, and consequently of their general scope. This is especially the case in the obscurer parts of Scripture, as, for instance, in the prophecies, and the more difficult of Paul's epistles. Why the exclusive use of versions should have this effect is easily explained. However paradoxical it may appear to others, those familiar with philology are well aware, that some parts of speech which, in the grammar, appear most insignificant, are, in the actual combinations of the language, very often most important. Connective particles and phrases, for example, though they cannot of themselves convey a definite idea, nor determine the meaning of an independent sentence, may powerfully influence the whole scope of a passage by determining the sequence and relation of its parts. How much may depend upon the presence or the absence of an interrogation; how much on the conversion of an *and* into a *but*, or of an *if* into a *for*; how much on the precise mode of supplying an ellipsis, which certainly exists, but may be variously filled. Even where the original exhibits no obscurity in these points, the translator, by an error of judgment or a simple inadvertence, with respect to something which he thinks of no importance, may distort the meaning of a proposition or the

general effect of a long line of propositions. And how vastly are the chances of this evil multiplied where the original is really obscure. And when to this we add the chances of mistake upon the reader's part, with respect to the meaning of the version itself, the aggregate amount of possibility of error is of course very great. Lest the evil should, however, be exaggerated, let it be again observed, that what has now been said applies, in any great degree, to none but the obscurer parts of scripture, and that even there, it affects not the substance of detached parts, but only their connexion with each other. This however is an evil of no trivial magnitude. It cannot be doubted, that multitudes of unlearned Christians have derived unspeakable advantage from some of the darkest and most faulty parts of the English version; because, with all the disadvantages of form, there is a principle of life there which nothing can destroy, a treasure of gold in an earthen vessel. But it is no less certain, that the ministry, the clergy—those who ought to have preceded their unlearned hearers, through the dark "places of the scripture, with a blazing torch, but have ingloriously chosen to grope with them in darkness—there can be no doubt that these have suffered loss, in their own souls, and in their usefulness to others, even from this single, and as some may think it, trifling cause of error, with respect to the connexion and coherence of the parts, even where the parts are separately not misunderstood. In proof of the extent to which the evil exists, we may again refer to the mode in which the public reading of the Scriptures is too commonly performed, especially the reading of the prophets and epistles. It is indeed not easy to obtain an opportunity of witnessing the former exhibition in some churches, where the public lessons are confined to the New Testament, perhaps with the addition of a few familiar psalms. It is not one of the glories of our church, that she makes no provision for the methodical reading of the Scriptures in her public service. It is the glory of the Protestant Episcopal church, throughout the world, that those who attend her services, however little they may profit by the preaching of her ministers, are sure to have the word of God dealt out to them in regular and goodly portions. But though our ministers are not required to read the Bible in a stated order, they are required to read it, and many at times read even the Old Testament, and even those parts of the Old Testament which are the most obscure in our version. At such times it is often very easy to perceive the

effect produced by the exclusive study of translations. If, for example, some sublime and interesting chapter of Isaiah is the subject of the operation, you shall hear it read precisely like a chapter of the same length in the book of Proverbs. Instead of being uttered as a coherent chain of sentences, it is transformed into a series of insulated aphorisms, which might just as well have stood in any other order. Another curious effect of the same cause is an almost superstitious reverence for the conventional and arbitrary separation of the text into chapters and verses. To those who can find out no connexion for themselves, a ready-made division is exceedingly convenient, and it is frequently amusing to observe with what fidelity the reader follows this unerring guide, even when it leads into inextricable nonsense. The first clause of a long verse, for example, may be quoted to establish or illustrate a position, and then the last clause must be added to complete the verse, however irrelevant or foreign to the subject. So in reading, some appear to think it sinful to abridge a chapter, even when the last part self-evidently appertains to the succeeding context. It may even be doubted whether some of our good brethren do not look upon the chapters as an inspired division of the text.

There is, however, a far more serious and extensive evil, arising from this want of clear perception in regard to the connexion of the Scriptures. This evil is the general neglect of the Old Testament. It is in that part of the English Bible that the nexus of the parts is most obscure: partly because the original itself is there more dark and broken; partly because the English version is less accurate and masterly in the Old Testament than in the New. Hence the prophecies are really a sealed book to multitudes of authorized expounders, sealed not by their own intrinsic difficulty, but by wilful ignorance. There are, indeed, difficulties which no erudition, ingenuity, and skill, have ever solved completely; but the persons here referred to, are unable to distinguish between these and other passages involving no such difficulty. Instead of learning to explain that which is explicable, they secretly set down the whole as unintelligible, and confine their labours to the more perspicuous scriptures. And this abandonment of the obscure parts of the Old Testament has led to a general neglect of all its parts. Many who are familiar with the gospels and epistles, have a vague feeling with respect to the Old Testament, as something antiquated and outlandish. I speak not now of those whose theological opinions lead them to disparage the Old Testa-

ment; but of those who receive it as a part of Holy Scripture, and in theory allow it equal rank with the New Testament. The incapacity to understand large parts of it, has led to the neglect of other parts and of the whole, so that, practically, the two Testaments which have, by God's Providence and Spirit, been joined together, are by his very ministers put asunder. Among the effects which have resulted, and must still result, from this neglect of the more ancient Scriptures, we may specify the following.

1. Comparative ignorance of all that precious truth which the Old Testament contains, and more especially of that immense amount which lies concealed in the obscurer and most slighted parts.

2. Shallow and erroneous views of the New Testament, arising from this want of acquaintance with the Old. What an idea must we form of the fulfilments which the one records, without a thorough knowledge of the prophecies and promises abounding in the other. What can he know of the winding up of God's decrees and dispensations, who is not familiar with the earlier scenes of the stupendous drama?

3. Doctrinal error, arising out of superficial notions of the system of divine grace, and these notions, in their turn, arising from the neglect to look at the two Testaments in mutual connexion. Can there be a doubt that the tendency to shallow and unworthy mutilations of the doctrine of atonement, has been owing in great measure to an ignorance of that which Christ and his apostles presuppose as known? We mean the ceremonial law and the Mosaic ritual.

4. From the want of insight into the connexion of the parts of Scripture, and the habit of regarding it as a succession of detached propositions, a habit fostered by the usual mode of printing bibles, has arisen a neglect of exposition, as a necessary part of public teaching, and a habit of discoursing altogether upon insulated sentences, thus leaving untouched an immense amount of sacred truth, and rendering that which is touched, disproportionate, unsatisfactory and obscure.

5. The neglect of the Old Testament has reduced, in an immense degree, the preachers store of scriptural illustration, by far the most attractive and acceptable to ordinary minds. Compare the Puritans, with their inexhaustible allusions to the history and poetry of the Old Testament, with some of our contemporaries, who appear to make no other use of that part of the Bible, than as a storehouse of fantas-

tic texts. A single conceit or quaint allusion struck out in the heat of composition, by an Owen or a Howe, shall furnish the foundation and a large part of the substance of a modern sermon. The mere froth cast up by the teeming effervescence of those mighty minds is gathered up like manna and laboriously wrought into unsubstantial aliment by some of their successors. For let it be remembered, to the honour of those noble preachers, that they never build a whole discourse on a conceit, but always on some great truth of the law or gospel. But then in the way of illustration, they make use of the Old Testament, to give an almost infinite variety and life to their instructions. The minutest incidents, the very proper names of the Old Testament, appear to have been stored up in their memory for use; and if that use is sometimes fanciful, it is but the flower of their scriptural research; its fruit is to be sought in their profound, consistent, comprehensive views of truth, and that depth and richness of experimental knowledge, which is never found apart from thorough knowledge of the Scriptures. The want of all this at the present day may be ascribed, at least remotely, to the neglect of the Old Testament, and more remotely still, to the exclusive study of the English version.

6. In default of illustration from the Scriptures, there is a tendency to seek it in rhetorical embellishments or abstract speculations. It is not too much to say, that the causes we have mentioned lie, in some degree, at the foundation of that speculative mode of handling truth, which has produced so much corruption and contention. Inferior minds, especially, when cut off from the vast resources furnished by an intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures, are delighted to adopt a succedaneum which costs nothing, to cloak their ignorance of God's word with the cant terms of a puerile philosophy, and even to hide their diminished heads by ducking them beneath the muddy waters of a spurious metaphysics. If you wish to save a young man of moderate abilities from the maniacal delusion of imagining that he is a deep thinker, and from an everlasting babble about *laws of mind*, set him to study the Old Testament in all its parts, in such a way as shall excite and task his faculties; and long before he finishes his work, he will repent and be ashamed of his philosophy.

7. If to any mind the evils, which have been described as springing from neglect of the Old Testament, should appear of small importance, let us add one other lesson, drawn from the experience of the church in Germany. The first assaults

upon the truth and inspiration of God's word, among the Germans, were aimed at the Old Testament, and for many years confined to it. Hence not a few, who had experimental faith in the New Testament, but who had been accustomed to neglect the Old, were drawn into the snare of neological criticism, under the impression that a great deal might be safely conceded, with regard to the Old Testament, without at all detracting from the truth and inspiration of the New. There have in fact been many cases, in that country, of apparently sincerely believers in the truth of Christianity, and in the divinity of the New Testament, who seemed almost prepared to go to any length with infidels in cavilling and carping at the rest of scripture. But mark the event. The very same principles of criticism and logic which were employed against the one, have now been turned with equal force against the other, and the mistaken souls in question are beginning to repent of their delusion, and to tremble for the mutilated basis of their faith. Let us learn wisdom from the folly of our neighbours. A prudent man foreseeth the evil and hideth himself, but the simple pass on and are punished.

But here the thought may possibly arise in some mind, that the evil we complain of has already been provided for. A new impulse has been given to the study of the original scriptures, new facilities have been provided, and a growing number are engaged in using them. All this is true, and calls for devout gratitude. But let us not imagine that the work is done, or that all the efforts made in this way tend to the promotion of the cause of truth. There are too many symptoms of a disposition to make biblical study a mere branch of polite learning, as it has been made in Germany. One of these symptoms is an obvious inclination to conduct the study, without any reference to the English version. If a man would have the reputation of a Greek or Hebrew scholar, he must be above the imputation of consulting, much less studying, the English Bible; he must ape the latest fashions of the German critics, and support himself by catalogues of German names. Now what has all this pedantry and foppery of learning to do with popular instruction? Critical works, for the instruction of the clergy, and the educated classes, are imperatively called for; but if biblical study is pursued by our ordinary pastors, merely as a polite accomplishment, it will only tend to the neglect of our own version, and, when it has attained its height, will leave the Christian ministry divided into

students of the English Bible who neglect Greek and Hebrew, and students of Greek and Hebrew who neglect the English Bible. Of the two extremes the former is to be preferred, because it is more likely to promote the growth of piety; but both extremes are hurtful. The bad effects resulting from an exclusive study of the version, have already been described. Those of the opposite extreme may be best learned by a single glance at Germany, where talent and learning of the highest order are without the least effect upon the general diffusion of religious truth. It may also be perceived, upon a small scale, here at home. There are men of talent, ministers and students, who pursue the study of the original Scriptures with some ardor, and with a sincere desire to make their acquisitions instruments of good to the community at large. And yet they find that, though they grow in knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, they are not the better qualified to benefit the public. The reason, as we apprehend, is that they keep their learning at a distance from their every-day employments and instructions. Their Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament are not upon the same shelf with their English Bible. What they study in the former is laid up in some repository when they go abroad; and the English version, with its old associations and impressions, is their exclusive text-book in the pulpit. Many a preacher of this class, after studying a passage in the Greek or Hebrew, and arriving at satisfactory results, has, on taking up the English, just relapsed into his old associations, and committed his old sins of misconception and mistake.

It is vain to talk of an amended version for popular use. The scheme is not merely an impracticable one, but the event is undesirable. It is morally certain that the new Bible would be far worse than the old, unless it should be thought a great improvement to translate Anglo-Saxon into Saxon of a very different sort, by the substitution of *progress* for *go*—*female* for *woman*—*individual* for *man*, and *transpired* for *came to pass*. And even were the version better, there are manifold advantages attending the conventional adoption of one bible as a common test and standard, while the imperfections of the version might be remedied, and even made occasions of extensive good, if those, whose work it is to teach it, would but do their duty. To sum up the evil and the remedy together—if the preachers of the gospel would but make themselves familiar with the English Bible, in the good old way, and then verify or rectify its versions by continual com-

parison with the divine original, and communicate the fruits of this comparison to those who are dependent on them for instruction, there would be new life infused into the study of the Scriptures; there would be a resurrection from the death-like stupor which so generally reigns. To every preacher who reads the Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament with critical attention, we would say, read them often with reference to the English version, and determine in relation to each sentence, as you read, whether the common version needs correction. This will fix your attention while engaged in study, and supply you with a test for your progressive growth in knowledge. It will also establish a fixed association between private studies and public performances. Many are indisposed to critical research, because it seems to be a thing remote from practical utility and duty. But if every new advance in learning qualifies the learner, not remotely but directly, for the duties of his office, these pursuits will be regarded, not as penances on one hand, or as pastimes on the other, but as necessary parts of a man's daily business. To those who, on the other hand, are utterly neglecting the original Scriptures, we make one suggestion. We are aware that it is usual to turn this matter off with levity and laughter, and that some men of standing in the church make a boast of their neglecting an important part of duty. We speak not now to such. We address ourselves to those who are willing to make use of any means which will increase their usefulness, but who are disposed to shrink from the repulsive task of wading once more through the bogs of Hebrew grammar and Greek syntax, as an unprofitable waste of time. Let not such discharge their conscience until they have reduced the matter to a fair experiment. Let any man, however great and numerous his burdens, form the habit of comparing but a single verse daily in the version and original. The mere act of reading the same thing in different languages will stimulate the faculties; the use of critical appliances and aids will be spontaneous, not compulsory; and sooner or later there will spring up, imperceptibly, an inclination to determine for one's self the sense of doubtful scriptures. This, under proper regulation, will be salutary, as it will give new life to the study of the scriptures, suggest innumerable fresh associations, and impart to what is known a new solidity and permanence. It will also, in time, produce genuine independence as to matters of opinion; a thing very different from the boyish swagger of affected fearlessness, in searching

after truth, which is frequently exhibited by lads who know less of the obscurer parts of Scripture than many a little girl in some unnoticed country Sunday school.

If this simple method were successfully adopted by our working clergy, we might look for good effects. Not to indulge the visionary hope of seeing Greek and Hebrew made familiar branches of a genteel education—though it might perhaps be thought that they have quite as good a claim to a place in the prospectuses of fashionable schools, as the art of breeding silk-worms, or converting beets to sugar—there are other effects not quite so visionary which may be expected. Among them are the following.

1. The minds of the clergy will be undergoing discipline, without oppressive labour or suspension of their duties.

2. The sense of the original Scriptures will be better understood by its expounders, and through them by the community.

3. The English Bible will be better appreciated, better understood, and more extensively made use of, both by ministers and people. That sort of biblical study which results in a neglect of our own Bible, or an insolent contempt of it, is not the sort required by our church and country. Nothing indeed would more effectually silence the vain prate of sciolists against our noble version, than a thorough understanding of its real defects, and its abounding excellences. No men were ever more familiar with our version than John Owen and John Flavel, and yet both perused it constantly in juxtaposition with the Greek and Hebrew.

4. This discriminating accurate acquaintance with the Bible would tend to reproduce that ancient love of it, which seems to have become extinct, except in a few corners, where the reign of ancient usage has continued undisturbed. And while the study of the original would render a man's knowledge more profound and thorough, the simultaneous study of the version would fill his mind and memory with its language, so that in preaching, prayer, and private conversation, without sanctimonious affectation or quaint oddity, his dialect would have a tinge, delightful to the Christian and the man of taste. A knowledge of the Bible in detail would be regarded as essential to the school boy and the youth at college, and we should not be compelled to receive into our seminaries, under the authority of venerable presbyteries, men who know almost as little of the Bible, as to definite and circumstantial knowledge, as they know about the Vedas

or the Zendavesta. An important step towards this end would be taken, if our young men, in preparing for a course of theological study, were advised, instead of reading philosophical or learned works above their reach, to make themselves consummate masters of the English Bible; and if every man, whatever his pretensions or his recommendations, were subjected to a rigorous examination, prior to admission into any of our seminaries, on this branch of knowledge; a branch which many a poor labourer in Scotland masters early in life; which would furnish the best possible foundation for the study of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures; and the want of which, at present, is a blot upon the reputation of our church and seminaries. In this respect, as well as others, a general reformation may be confidently looked for, when the ministry at large shall do their duty to the scriptures. Then too the ministers of Christ would not be satisfied with coldly and mechanically reading the sublimest parts of scripture without comment, even when obscured by an erroneous or imperfect version; but their minds would sometimes overflow with brief and pertinent remark, filling up the yawning chasms, shedding light on the dark places, and converting thorns and briars into flowers and fruits of Paradise.

5. The return to scripture and good sense would expel, from the pulpit and the press, that farrago of cant phrases and bad English which now constitutes the lingua franca of religious society. If we must have cant, let it be the cant of scripture, not the cant of ignorant and vulgar fanaticism. He whose mind is overflowing with the rich, pure phraseology of scripture, and the older English writers, cannot stoop to borrow either thoughts or language from the newspaper-office or the tabernacle-platform. When the Bible is more studied, there will be less disposition to adopt the floating slang of our ephemeral literature. We shall hear fewer great swelling words from little men on small occasions. We shall hear less of "great principles," "broad principles," &c. from men who seem to have none, either broad or narrow; less of moral this, and moral that, from men whose own morality is more than problematical; and less about the laws of mind, and grasp of mind, and march of mind, from those whose quality of mind would almost tempt us to believe, that the less mind there is, the more it grasps and marches. In short, the reign of cant would cease before the growing prevalence of scripture and good sense. Theologians would exchange the slang of modern metaphysics for the technics of the Bible; and the

jargon of Ashdod would be swept into oblivion by the long-lost language of Canaan.

6. After such a revolution, we may confidently look for one still more important. With the language of Ashdod the idolatry of Ashdod shall be swept away. When the study of the Bible shall again begin to occupy the minds of men, it will preclude that state of restless indolence which breeds fanaticism in all its forms. Well may we say in our day, as Gurnall said in his: We see what advantage Satan hath got in these loose times, since we have learned to fight him out of order, and the private soldier hath taken the officer's work out of his hands. But this shall have an end. Our laity, instead of laying hold upon the ark of God, to shake or keep it steady, will learn from the example of the Uzzahs, who have been already "smitten for their error," to observe their proper place, and find delightful occupation in the unfathomed depths of Holy Scripture. Into those same depths will be plunged some of the other sex, who now "learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house, and not only idle but tattlers also, and busy bodies, speaking things which they ought not," and doing things which better become men than women. It is also to be feared that the same gulf will swallow up certain organizations which, by some, are deemed essential to the being of the church; that the moral-reform cause, and the vegetable-food cause, and a host of other causes, which are now so numerous that we really seem to have more causes than effects, will be absorbed in the one great cause of truth and holiness. Then shall these kingdoms of the world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ; and instead of beholding Christianity cut up into a dozen small religions, each with its altar, and its ephod, and its teraphim, its urim and thummim, its expurgated Bible, and its priest to slay the character of Christian men for sacrifice, we shall behold the unadulterated scripture, like the roll of the Apocalypse, spread out before the people, the pure flame of God's altar burning free from all obstruction, and the spiritual idols falling prostrate from their pedestals, while from the throne of God a voice shall be heard saying: If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book, and if any man shall take away from the words of this book, God shall take away his part out of the book of life.

7. Finally, the Christian would have little satisfaction in the prospect of these mere external changes, if he could not see beneath them an internal revolution more momentous

still. The objectionable forms, in which religious ardor shows itself, are mere external indications, that there is something wrong in the religion which produces them. The restless, turbulent, censorious spirit, which so generally reigns, is the product of shallow, superficial views and exercises in the hearts of men. Now the study of the Bible, among ministers and people, while it will unfit them for fanatical excess, will give them deeper insight into their own hearts, and make them feel that there is more to be done there than they supposed. And instead of imagining, as some have taught, that their own souls will take care of themselves if they are faithful, as they call it, to the souls of others; they will learn that they cannot do a worse thing for their neighbours, than to let their own souls run to waste. Instead of believing that the care of our own hearts will make us selfish and indifferent to others, they will learn, that it is only out of the abundance of the heart that the mouth speaks to advantage; that the opus operatum of external effort, made from stress of conscience or a vague feeling of benevolence, is likely, in the long run, to do more harm than good; and that the only sort of active effort likely to be lasting, and ultimately useful, is that which overflows, without constraint, from the swelling of a heart which has been filled, in secret places, and by means with which a stranger intermeddled not. We have only to lift up our eyes, in these days of reaction and collapse, to see multitudes who, in keeping other men's vineyards, have let their own vineyard run to desolation; and we may even walk upon the graves of some who have preached to other men like sons of thunder or sons of consolation, and themselves been cast away. And thus it will be till this process is inverted by a closer acquaintance with the truth of God; till, instead of trusting to mere effort for religion, men shall trust to religion for the effort which is wanted. Then there will be less talk about moral machinery, but more profound and intimate communion with that God, without whose finger all machinery stands still, or falls to pieces, or explodes. The stream of men's religion will make less noise than it now does; it will foam less; it will cast up far less mire and dirt; but instead of being sucked in by the sands of the first desert, it will gradually rise and overflow its banks, not with a transient and impetuous inundation, but with general expansion, until stream meets stream, and all dividing lines are lost in one great gathering of the waters.

- ART. IV.—1. *Mammon or Covetousness the Sin of the Christian Church.* By the Rev. John Harris. Second edition from the tenth London edition. Boston. 1837.*
2. *Anti-Mammon: or an Exposure of the Unscriptural Statements of Mammon, with a Statement of True Doctrine as maintained by sound Divines, and derived from Holy Scripture.* By two Clergymen. Second edition. London. 1837.

IT is not with any intention of making known the work of Mr. Harris, denominated “Mammon,” that we now introduce it to the notice of our readers. While, in England, it has met with a most rapid sale and extended to numerous editions, it has, in this country also, reached a second edition, and has been very extensively circulated. It has received the highest recommendations both from the press and the pulpit, from members of all denominations and of every party. Even they who are most sincerely and deeply interested in the reformation of our own church in doctrine and practice, have been heard to urge this work upon the attentive consideration of their people. There is so much to admire in the general arrangement and sentiment of the work, that criticism appeared to be disarmed. The object at which it aims, is one so universally allowed to be of the most pressing necessity, and the spirit-stirring appeals which are here addressed to the conscience of the covetous transgressor, seem so well adapted to awaken even the most sluggish soul to thoughtfulness, that in the perusal of the work all suspicion of erroneous or improper statements is completely removed.

“Anti-Mammon” professes to be written by two clergymen of the established church of England. The work is divided into six parts. First, an “Introduction,” giving a statement of the reasons which led to its publication, including the great popularity of “Mammon,” and the high authority under whose auspices that book was published. Then follows “The Inquiry,” in which is brought forward the several erroneous views presented in that work. Next “The Analogy,” showing the similarity of these errors to those embraced by Arminius, Episcopius, Corvinus, and

* Our quotations are made from the first edition.

others. The fourth chapter of the work is styled "The Witnesses." Charnock, Owen, Luthur, Calvin, Henry, Sanderson, and others, being brought forward to testify against the errors in question. Then follows "The Decision," and "The Improvement." This work, of which we have given an outline, had reached a second edition in 1837, but a short time after its publication.

It is manifest that there is a wide-spread conviction in the church, that the sin of covetousness is fatally prevalent within it, as well as in the world; and that to resist and overcome this evil, there should be put into requisition all her resources. It is also manifest, on the other hand, that with this growing zeal and this spirit of enlarging benevolence, there is also awakened in the church, by that promised Spirit whose office it is to guide into all truth, an increasing attention to the doctrines of God's word, as the true pillar and ground of all piety and of all permanent success. Of this there is sufficient proof in the great demand for works bearing on the subject of benevolence—in the fact that "Mammon" was only one out of a hundred and forty-three Essays offered for the prize to which it was declared entitled—and in the great and continued sale of this book. When these facts are viewed in connexion with the appearance of such a work as *Anti-Mammon*, and the excitement produced by doctrinal discussions among almost every denomination of Christians at the present time, there is much to encourage us to hope that the Lord will arise and shine upon Zion, making her a praise in the whole earth. In this returning attention to "the doctrines that be of God," and this sifting of them as wheat from the chaff of philosophy and human speculations with which they have been commingled, "we rejoice, yea, and will rejoice," believing, with these anonymous writers, that "a wide-spread and increasing indifference to sound doctrine, is the present great sin of the Christian Church."

It is in this view of the subject, as being one of permanent interest and essential importance, we have thought it advisable, even at this late hour, to call attention to this work. Error is not merely a speculation, which may be treasured up among the abstractions of the understanding, far removed from any practical influence over the heart and life. It is, on the contrary, necessarily connected with the life and actions of him who holds it, for, in his active powers, man must conduct himself in subordination to the dictates of his

intellectual faculties. Error in opinion or in principle can never, therefore, lead to beneficial results. However much it may seem, in man's wisdom, to spur on the lagging zeal of cold and lukewarm Christians, and to excite to great and self-denying efforts, it will terminate in the injury or complete destruction of whatever cause it is employed to assist. Thus in reference to the promulgation of the gospel and the extension of the kingdom of Christ, let the following principles, which are very current at this present time, and with which "Mammon" is deeply imbued, be adopted by any church or association, as most likely to give animation and zeal in the accomplishment of this glorious work. In regard to God, let it be laid down as axiomatic, that he has purposed the salvation of all the heathen; that in this purpose his will has been defeated by his creatures; and that by our failure in duty we can prevent the accomplishment of these divine purposes of mercy. As it regards the church, let it be laid down as equally certain, that to the church is committed the business of conversion, and that she is responsible for the results of the means she is commanded to employ, as well as for the proper use of those means. And in reference to the heathen world, let it be determined, that they are all provided for in the decree of election, or at least in the effectual grace purchased for his people by the blood of Christ; and further, that the time is certainly near at hand when they shall all be converted unto God. Let these principles be adopted into the creed of the Christian philanthropist, and made the principles of his conduct, and what must be the assured result? They will infallibly lead to the most unworthy conceptions of the character, purposes, and requirements of heaven. They will breed the most unwarranted expectations, and thus lead on to the most misdirected and therefore fruitless efforts. In the event of the failure of such self-formed anticipations, discouragement will take possession of the heart, and paralyse its energies. There will be a growing indifference to the means employed, in an eager and all-absorbing pursuit of the end. That end being considered necessary in point of duty, all means likely to secure its attainment come to be regarded as equally necessary and proper. Human wisdom usurps the throne, and its plans and measures are substituted for the less popular and effective suggestions of the divine word. God is thus dishonoured and provoked. His Spirit is withdrawn. A spirit of practical atheism takes possession of the church. A system of

lifeless efforts is pursued which can be productive only of what is "of the earth, earthy," until at length the torpor of spiritual decay seizes upon the paralyzed frame of the church, now destitute of all vitality.

Now it is acknowledged on all hands, though not felt as it should be, that it is the duty of the church to preach the gospel to every creature. But in the performance of this duty, she may employ unhallowed means, she may give currency to unscriptural motives, she may spread abroad adulterated views of divine truth, or she may enter into alliances by which the integrity of Christian doctrine is more and more undermined, and its value and importance more and more depreciated. In like manner is it allowed by all Christians, that the sin of covetousness is delusive, dangerous, and alarmingly prevalent. But in striving together for the extirpation or correction of this evil, we may sow the seeds of error, we may foster pharisaic pride, and thus destroy that very church we were professedly labouring to uphold. Let it be remembered that error is always most dangerous when she comes wearing the appearance of an angel of light—when she is clothed in the garb of Christian charity—speaks in tones of touching pity—and proclaims her zeal for the Lord of hosts. Therefore are we the more alarmed to find in a work professedly advocating the claims of God, and the claims of their fellow men, upon the professed followers of the Lamb, such statements as are adapted to bring blight and mildew over the fair promise of the coming glories of the church.

It is somewhat remarkable that a work so frequently reprehensible in its style, should have been welcomed with such unqualified approbation. To notice but a few examples of faulty style. In p. 6, the author speaks of man constituting himself the centre "of an all-subordinating circle." In p. 11, he says the exhibition of divine grace "should at least have the effect of converting angels into seraphs, and his servants into flames of fire," as if seraphs were not angels, and as if to be a flame of fire was greater dignity than to be a seraph. In p. 12, he talks of every human being "feeling it (i. e. the character of God) to be looking on himself," and in the same page he speaks of Christ "pouring out the blood of our nature," and "making its soul (i. e. our nature's) an offering for sin." Again, on p. 12, he represents Christ as having "absorbed our interest," as if Christ had "sucked it up as a sponge," or "engrossed it wholly to himself." In

p. 13, he says "the character of Christ was formed on the principle of a laborious endeavour to recall the departed spirit of benevolence—to baptize it afresh," &c., that is, to baptize afresh—the departed spirit. Even should the word "it" be here referred to "the world," it leaves the sentence in a very awkward position. In p. 14, he tells us of "magnificent objects of affection." He says, on p. 15, "the church was constructed on the principal of consolidating—the operations of divine benevolence." In p. 31, we have the following truly bombastic rhapsody. "The amplitude of the divine love seeks to comprehend the universe in its large and life-giving embrace (i. e. of the amplitude), and calls on our affections to arise and follow in its vast diffusion," &c. In p. 51, he speaks of Christians "systematically incapacitating themselves for any thing more than scanty driblets." In p. 53, he talks of a man who "was born with the world in his heart." Not to delay, we will afford one other sample of the powers of this author when he affects the sublime. On p. 200, he thus delivers himself. Speaking of the world, he says, "men have filled it with sin; but he (God) notwithstanding keeps it filled with his goodness. The overflowing fulness of the ocean—the amplitude of the all-encompassing air—the unconfined plenitude of the light—all conspire to attest the infinite exuberance of his bounty, and to surcharge your heart with corresponding sentiments of goodness." Truly this is *vox et præterea nihil*.

Such blemishes are, however, venial. They result from the overstrained exertions of a mind carried by the vehemence of feeling beyond the limits of propriety, and without strength to sustain itself in such a lofty flight. Not such, however, are the doctrinal mis-statements of the author of "Mammon." We shall point out some of them in the order of their occurrence.

The first statement in the work (see Section first) in which the heavens "replenished with bright intelligences" are represented to have been created prior to the earth, is at least a questionable one, on which Scripture is either silent or to which it is on the whole opposed. While Origen, and some other Greek and Latin writers, thought the angels were created before the earth, yet it was the opinion of the Hebrews, and of Augustine and of Origen himself in some parts of his writings, that they were brought into being contemporaneously with the formation of the earth. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Now al-

though Job 38: 4—7 favours our author's opinion, which is perhaps most reasonable, when the very foundation of a work is laid in doubt and uncertainty, it argues badly for the construction of the future building.

In this same section the chief end of man is thus described, "By creating at first one common father of the species, he (God) designed that each individual should feel himself allied to all the rest, and pledged to promote their happiness," and "thus he sought to teach us to find and fabricate our own happiness from the happiness of others." "If the former, the angelic creation was meant to exemplify how much his creatures could enjoy, the latter was intended to show how much they could impart." This is a very different theory from that laid down in the standards of the Christian church, as expressive of the unequivocal declarations of the word of God, "Man's chief end is (not to promote the happiness of others), but to glorify God (in this and every other way which is commanded), and to enjoy him (and not to fabricate a happiness for himself by hewing out to himself broken cisterns that can hold no water). And as to the angelic hosts—where did Mr. Harris learn that their office and end was "to exemplify how much creatures could enjoy?" To what scripture, to what author, to what reasonable consideration is not this opposed? The very name "angel," every recorded fact concerning angels, lead us necessarily to consider them as "ministering spirits sent forth" by God, instrumentally to carry on his vast designs, and thus glorify his great and holy name.

From this beginning we may easily anticipate the progress of the drama; for if man was created for the fabrication of his own happiness, and angels for enjoyment, we may be very sure that God will be forgotten, and his name dishonoured. From such premises, what other conclusion could be drawn? Our author therefore, in Section II., proceeds to inform us, "But the awful invasion of sin frustrated the divine intention, destroyed it even in its type and model." Degrading as this representation of the character of God is, in making him such an one as ourselves, weak, imperfect, short-sighted, variable, and liable to disappointment, it is not a hasty or mere incidental remark. In p. 19, God is described as endeavouring to recover by the gospel what he had lost by the fall. "It was bringing to a trial the darling principle of heaven, and the great principle of all revolt and sin. It was confronting selfishness, in its own region, with

a system of benevolence, prepared as its avowed antagonist by the hand of God himself." Thus, again, on p. 126, it is said, "An enterprise of mercy in which God had embarked his highest glory, and which involved the happiness of the world, was arrested and lost to myriads by a spirit of worldly gain." Again, on p. 171, "He is yearning for the happiness of the perishing world; but such is his divine plan, that he has only the instrumentality of his church to work by, and that is so steeped in the spirit of selfishness, that his grace is held under restraint." Is this, we may ask, the language of sober reason? Is it the voice of a Christian—a believer in the bible—of one acquainted with our God, even the Lord Jehovah? Is this language capable of application to that God "who is able to subdue all things unto himself, (Phil. 3: 21) with whom there is nothing too hard, (Gen. 18: 14. Jer. 32: 17, and v. 27) who doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of earth (Dan. 4: 35), the great, the mighty God, the Lord of Hosts is his name (Jer. 32: 18). If referred to this mighty God, "with whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning," and against whom "there is no wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel, seeing he frustrateth the tokens of liars and turneth wise men backward and maketh their knowledge foolish" (Prov. 21: 30. Is. 44: 25), then is it not a libel upon his character, and blasphemous against his infinite majesty? Instead of praising God because "the Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth, by understanding hath established the heavens," we are here called upon to sympathise with him in the discomfiture of all his plans, and the overthrow of all his purposes of mercy. Such a view of Deity is not only unscriptural, it is unreasonable, it is unworthy of even heathen ignorance. Let Homer rebuke "Mammon" when he says of Jupiter,

All power is his, and whatsoe'er he wills,
The will itself omnipotent fulfils.*

We have seen this author's view of the original and designed purpose of man's creation; what is his view of man's present condition? In p. 7, he says of self-love, "In man it is the principle which impels him, &c. Not only is it consistent with piety, it is the stock on which all piety in lapsed man is grafted. Piety is only the principle of self-love, carried out in the right direction, and seeking its supreme hap-

* See Od. B. 14, l. 496.

piness in God. It is the act or habit of a man who so loves himself as to give himself to God. Selfishness is fallen self-love." Self-love is not therefore a fallen principle—man therefore can convert himself—man can seek and obtain his supreme happiness—he can do this without God only by carrying out his self-love—and the influence of the Holy Spirit is unnecessary, since self-love is the stock of all piety. This is the concentrated essence of Pelagianism, and it is pure Pagan theology, as appropriate to the porch of the academy as to the pulpit.

The dethronement of God, on which this new theory is founded, and its consequent ungodliness, is further apparent from the author's account of sin. Sin, he tells us, is misery, and involves its perpetrators in ruin and everlasting destruction from the presence of God, not because it is a crime against the authority, holiness, justice and goodness of God, but because it is committed against the sinner himself, and is injurious to his own happiness. "All sin is selfishness" is the title of Section III. "Selfishness is the universal form of human depravity, every sin that can be named is only a modification of it." Now it is true that all sin is selfish, but selfishness is not all of sin. It might as well be said that all sin is pride, since pride enters into it, or is mingled with it; but is pride therefore all sin? Whence cometh this selfishness, and this pride, and this lust, and this carnality? "Out of the heart," saith the Saviour. "Enmity to God is ungodliness;" this is the fruitful mother of all sin—this is its damning guilt. The author himself says, in another place, that "sin produced selfishness"—the parent therefore cannot be the child, nor that child all the parent. What then produced sin? Not surely selfishness, which was by it produced. The author contradicts his own fundamental doctrine, according to the custom of errorists, on p. 57 and p. 99. He here says that "every act of wickedness does not originate in cupidity, but while many sources of sin exist there is no description of crime which this vice has not prompted men to commit." As error begets error, and thus propagates the mischief, the view just given of that spiritual disease under which fallen humanity labours, leads to an equally unscriptural representation of the remedy provided in the gospel. "It must be obvious then that the *great want* (his own italics) of fallen humanity, is a specific against selfishness, the epidemic disease of our nature." The salvation needed by sinners is not, it would appear, reconciliation with

God, restoration to his favour, justification in his sight, and the implantation of holiness; but a specific against selfishness! "It is the glory of the gospel that it was calculated and arranged on the principle of restoring to the world the lost principle of benevolence." This language is frequently repeated.* The doctrine it contains is deliberately laid down. It is then, according to this author, the boast and glory of the gospel—not that it makes proclamation of that Redeemer "who came into the world to save sinners, to redeem us from the curse of the law, to reconcile us unto God, that we might have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins; that we may be presented by him unto God, holy and unblamable and unreprouvable,"—but that it contains a specific against selfishness—a specific which the author confesses to have hitherto almost universally failed of success, because of the greater strength of that selfishness. The conclusion to which we are brought by this writer as to the character of "the glorious gospel of the blessed God" is, that it is a well-intentioned plan of mercy, as likely to fail as to succeed, and which has hitherto been defeated or arrested in its progress. See pages 11, 13, 14, 15 and 17.

In this novel scheme of redemption, what office is ascribed to Christ? "In all he did he thought of the world. His character was formed on the principle of a laborious endeavour to recall the departed spirit of benevolence," (p. 13). "Can we wonder at the energy and frequency with which he denounced it (covetousness), when we remember how frequently it came into direct personal contact with himself, defeating his tenderest solitudes, and robbing him of souls he yearned to save?" (see p. 59). "This it was which constituted his fitness to wage war with selfishness, and to become the leader of the hosts of the God of love in their conflicts with a selfish world," (see p. 98). As Christ was thus manifested not to glorify God but for the sake of the world, and that he might discover and make known a specific against selfishness, so is he represented as constituting "the resources" of the church (see p. 17), and as only one of the gifts of God to the world, "every man from the moment of his conversion being meant to be a new donation to the world," (see p. 223). Well may the believer in him who, as our Prophet, reveals to us, by his word and Spirit, the will of

* See pages 18 and 19.

God—who, as our Priest, offered up himself a sacrifice to reconcile us to God, and now makes continual intercession for us—and who, as our King, subdues us to himself, rules and defends us, and restrains and conquers all his and our enemies—when such an account of this adorable Saviour is presented before him, exclaim, in bitterness of soul, “Ye have taken away my Lord, and I know not where ye have laid him.”

If Christ, in his offices and dignity is thus lowered and debased, the crown being taken from his brow, the sceptre from his hands, and all power and authority from his mediatorial work, we may be sure that the church will be proportionally magnified and exalted in her official character. “He instituted a church for the express purpose of employing it for the benefit of the world,” p. 15. “Feeling themselves reinforced with the benevolence of heaven they would meditate the conversion of the world.” “Nothing less than the salvation of the whole world would be regarded by them as the complement of their number, the fulfilment of *their* office, and the consummation of their joy,” p. 17.

“They felt they were constituted trustees for the world; executors of a Saviour who had bequeathed happiness to man; guardians of the most sacred rights in the universe.” “No elements essential to success has been left out of its arrangements (i. e. the church); all those elements have always been in the possession of the church. Why has the gospel been threatened, age after age, with failure? Owing entirely to the selfishness of the church,” p. 22. “That our blessed Lord consecrated his church to the high office of converting the world is evident,” see p. 123. “He is yearning for the happiness of the perishing world—but the church is so steeped in the spirit of selfishness (and that is all he has to work by), that his grace is held under restraint. And even the limited degree in which their selfishness has allowed him to bless their agency,” &c. p. 171. In p. 225, the church is described as now “hastening to atone for the past by instituting one society after another,” &c. See also pp. 131, 169 and 197.

The representation which is thus made of the office, duty, and power of the church, we regard as a most melancholy perversion of the truth. Mr. Harris probably supposed that by elevating the standard of duty the members of the church would be awakened to activity and zeal. But in thus magnifying the office of the church he commits sacrilege upon

the sacred prerogatives of heaven; he idolatrously gives that glory to the church which is due only to the head of the church; he blasphemously (we had almost said) subjects God to the treachery and selfishness of his creatures, while he practically denies the existence, influence, necessity, and power of the Holy Ghost. To almost all of these statements we might oppose a direct contradiction. It is not true that it is the duty of the church to convert the world. It is not true in any sense that the salvation of the whole world is the fulfilment of the office of the church. It is not true that the church can limit the grace of God, and arrest his plans and discomfit all his measures. It is not true that by any amount of self-denial or effort, the church can atone for her past negligences and offences. There is no truth as we believe in these assumptions. They flatly contradict the Bible. They are dishonourable to God. They imply duties and involve powers which are "impossible to men," and only "possible to God."

An erroneous conception of the nature and design of the church we consider the *πρωτον ψευδος* of this author and of that system of Theology which he advocates, and which has gone far in England as it has in this country to dethrone Christ, and to lead men to question whether there be any Holy Ghost.* The church is the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, to which Christ has given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life to the end of the world. By it the gospel is to be proclaimed—but not applied so as to become effectual to salvation—the church preaches, but Christ alone saves. By the church are all men to be warned and to be made acquainted with the commandments and requisitions of heaven—but sinners can be born again only "from above of the Spirit." It is the duty of the church to bear witness to the truth, to preserve and propagate it—it is the prerogative of God to "sanctify through that truth." "Preach the gospel to every creature"—this is the business of the church. "And lo, I am with you always"—this is the encouragement and all-sufficient strength and efficiency of the church's manifestations. "Teach them all things whatsoever I have commanded"—this is the office imposed upon his church by Him who is its head and

* We refer to a work by Mr. Jenkyn on "the Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church," in which a comparison is instituted between the Holy Spirit and Aristotle, and the Spirit declared to be present in and with his word only as Aristotle is in his writings.

who, as the Prince and Saviour of his people, gives repentance and remission of sins. Never did Christ transfer his kingly and royal authority, his divine and glorious efficiency, to his church. Never did He give that glory to the church which is due only to God, "with whom is the residue of the Spirit," who alone "giveth grace and glory." Never would a work so infinitely beyond all mortal strength, be imposed by God upon his weak and erring creatures. That this was the view which the apostles took of their office and work we might make abundantly evident. Thus Peter declares "And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," Acts 10: 42, 43. "Ye shall be witnesses unto me said the risen Saviour—unto the uttermost parts of the earth," (Acts 1: 8.) Thus they went "every where preaching the word." But so far were the apostles from believing that "nothing less than the salvation of the whole world would fulfil their office," that we find them abandoning to utter and self-chosen ruin those who "put the gospel away from them," and rejoicing that even when their overtures of divine mercy were rejected, their work was nevertheless accomplished, their conscience satisfied, and God glorified. Hear the apostle Paul, "Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish. To the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life: and who is sufficient for these things?" 2 Cor. 2: 14—16. The true intent and purpose for which the church was ordained, and the ministry appointed, is expressed by this same apostle in his Epistle to the Ephesians, ch. 3: 8—11, "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now, unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

To represent this creature of God, this machinery which He works for his own glory primarily and supremely, and not for the sake of that machinery itself, as having power to limit the grace of God, to defeat his plans, and to prevent the accomplishment of his purpose, is, we sincerely think, most impious. It is shocking to every feeling of reverence and piety. What Christian mind can read the language we have quoted; especially out of the mouth of a "teacher in Israel," without shuddering?*" "To ascribe the present condition of the heathen to an act of divine sovereignty, is not in accordance with the declarations of Scripture."† Such is the doctrine which is becoming current in certain portions of the church, which with a sickly affectation of piety, rather than allow the condemnation and present outcast condition of the heathen to be the manifestation of divine anger, and of the "righteous judgment" of God, strips God of all that constitutes him supreme, infinite, and glorious, as the Sovereign of the universe. Let us abide by the scriptures, and put away from us all vain and foolish imaginations of men. Hear the language of the apostles in the synod of Jerusalem, recorded in the book of Acts, ch. 15: 13—18, "And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up; that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." On this subject the remarks of the authors of *Anti-Mammon* are most seasonable and comfortable‡ to our minds, even as the views presented in *Mammon*, while ostensibly offered in furtherance of the great cause of missions, have filled us with fearful and gloomy apprehensions. That the church has failed to discharge her duty is lamentably true. That she is on this account criminally guilty before God is equally certain. That she is now under

* "It should not be evaded nor blinked," says Mr. Jenkyn, "that the divine plans are susceptible of failures. This failure has taken place in the atonement," &c.

† See *Eclectic Rev.* 1838, p. 313.

‡ See Chapter 6.

imperative obligations to send the gospel to every nation under heaven, as far as she has the ability and the opportunity, is also indubitable. But that God has fulfilled his own purposes, and will be glorified in his justice, righteousness and truth by what, as it regards the conduct of the church, was only evil, is what, with the Scriptures as his standard, no man dare deny. The revealed will of God, his commands, promises, and declarations, is the rule of duty to the church and to believers, in obedience to which they render acceptable service unto God, and glorify his name, whether it is his secret will to grant success to such self-denying efforts or to withhold that success. For this obedience to all that is required, and for this consecrated liberality and devotedness thus made necessary, the church, in every individual member, is held responsible to the Judge of the whole earth. But whether such labours shall result in the conversion or aggravated impenitence of men, and shall thus become a savour of life or of death, is among those "secret things which belong unto God," and is not a matter over which the church has any control, or for which she is responsible. Whether therefore the millenium is near or afar off, whether missionary efforts shall be made instrumental to the universal establishment of Christianity throughout the earth, or shall, after a temporary triumph, be defeated by the great adversary and by the wickedness of men—it is not less the duty of the church to go forward in a bold, unyielding and faithful discharge of the duties required of her in the word of God. Animated by this spirit of implicit confidence in the wisdom, and unhesitating obedience to the authority of God, the church would be unmoved by the storms of adversity, undismayed by all the trials of disappointment, and unharmed by the enjoyment of prosperity, rejoicing that whether by prosperity or adversity God was glorified.

As we regard this subject of vital importance and one which has not been duly considered, we would quote the language of the Rev. Francis Good, the author of "The Better Covenant," in his sermon before the Church Missionary Society, in April last.

"There is yet one topic left, with which I will conclude; a topic intimately connected with missionary enterprise, and too important, in every way, to be omitted; though, to some of you, perhaps, I may seem, by what shall be said, rather to damp your energies, in this holy cause. I mean, our legitimate expectations: the prospects of success, which the word

of God authorises Christians to expect, in this work and labour of love.

"I am aware, that there are those, who look for the universal establishment of the gospel in the earth, the promised enlargement and triumph of the church, in the latter day, as the result of efforts, such as this and other societies are making for the diffusion of the light of life. By these they trust that the present twilight of Christian principle will, gradually, and imperceptibly, increase into the brightness of that day of glory, and universal blessedness, of which all prophecy is full. My brethren, I should be extremely sorry, on this interesting occasion, unnecessarily to do violence to the prejudices of any; but it is due to truth to confess, that I have no such expectations. I am deeply convinced, that they are grounded on entirely mistaken views of the character of the present Gentile dispensation. The times of the Gentiles (Luke 21: 24.) which are now fast running out, are times (as I conceive) in which God (according to that remarkable, but little heeded testimony of St. James) is visiting the Gentiles, to take out of them a people unto his name, (Acts 15: 14.) They are times, therefore, of an election, and of an election only, so long as they last: and the most rapid and superficial glance at the history of the church, and especially of Christian Missions, is sufficient to show, that, hitherto, at least, such has been the character of the dispensation, throughout the 1800 years during which it has continued. No where has Christianity been permanent, in any thing like its original purity. The light is gone out, which once shone so bright, in the seven churches of Asia. The same has been the case with Carthage, and its neighbourhood—Christian Egypt—Christian Persia—where are they? These countries are Christian no longer. Christianity has visited place after place, not retaining its conquests; but remaining, perhaps, for a few centuries, at most, it has "taken out a people," and been content. No where has there been an instance of a truly righteous nation; of Christianity sanctifying the great masses of a population; of a people generally, and truly righteous; acknowledging Christ as King, and ordering themselves by his laws. Such has been our experience hitherto, and such we believe it will be "till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Then, and not before, the present dispensation will be succeeded by a dispensation of glory, introduced by the King himself from heaven, whose name is Jehovah our Righteousness.

(Jer. 23: 6.) Then shall be seen, in the restored Jewish nation, the first example of a truly righteous nation; as it is foretold of them, thy people shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever, (Is. 60: 21.) And then shall all those glorious predictions receive their literal and full accomplishment, which describe the reign of holiness and happiness throughout the earth. The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea, (Habak. 2: 14.) From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name (saith Jehovah) shall be great among the Gentiles, and, in every place, incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering, (Mal. 1: 11.)

“Thus, the the triumph, the full establishment of his gospel in the earth, is reserved to Jesus himself. The light of the world—the sun of righteousness. And I feel, that these sober and chastened views of the probable result of missionary exertion, in the present dispensation are of the utmost importance, if we would escape discouragement, and mortification, at the supposed failure of legitimate hopes, in the continued prevalence of ungodliness, both at home and abroad. A painful and very injurious re-action must be the consequence of extravagant, and unscriptural expectation; as if the universal triumph of the gospel were to be achieved by any instrumentality, such as is now employed. Beloved, ye are, indeed, the light of the world; but mistake not the character in which ye shine. Ye are the candle of the Lord (ver. 15,) in the midst of prevailing darkness. Ye may, ye shall illumine the night; but ye may not utterly dispel, and annihilate it. It is Jesus himself, who is the sun. It is his manifestation, which shall make that day of glory, to which all prophecy directs our longing gaze. But, in the mean time, remember your privilege is not small. It is the very same with that of apostles themselves, and of prophets, and all the cloud of witnesses who preceded them; by all means to save some (1 Cor. 9: 22): to shine for Christ amidst surrounding gloom: yes, and by your blessed shining, to gather out to Christ, in successive generations, a multitude which no man can number, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, (Rev. 7: 9.) Let your light then so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven, (ver. 16.) Be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord, (1 Cor. 15: 58.) Amen.”

There are other points to which it was our purpose to advert—such as the character given of the Christian (see p. 210, and p. 225), where benevolence and holiness are seemingly identified—the perfection ascribed to Christians, (see p. 170, “God gloried in them”)—the most reprehensible exhibition of the church in her present character, “as the scorn of an infidel world, which has defrauded millions of the offer of eternal life,” (p. 36;) “there where we might have looked for the sepulchre of all the evil passions we find their rendezvous and their home;”* the sneering and presumptuous tone with which he abuses the doctrine of the divine decrees, election, and a limited atonement, (see p. 29, &c.;) and the spirit of liberalism which runs through the book, boasting of indifference to truth.† We could also wish to point out some of the defects of this work as a treatise on covetousness,‡ and its dangerous tendency;§ but our space will not permit us to go on. And perhaps we have said enough to convince the most incredulous of the erroneous doctrinal statements of this book. We may be thought severe; but when the truth as it is in Jesus is so insidiously attacked, and in danger of such extensive injury, “woe is unto us” if we “contend not earnestly for the faith,” “rebuking” those who would slanderously misrepresent it “before all, that they may be put to silence.” “If the foundations are destroyed, what shall the righteous do?” We give God thanks that he has raised up witnesses for himself, who have nobly confronted popular applause in the stern maintenance of his righteous cause. For the success which has attended their efforts we also praise Him. We hail this awakening attention to the doctrines of the Bible—the doctrines of the early church—the doctrines of the Reformers—the doctrines of the Puritan Fathers—as an omen of great good. While erecting that glorious temple composed of living stones, which shall be to the praise of the glory of God’s grace, we must take heed that we mingle not with the gold and silver and precious stones, hay, wood and stubble, and thus render it unfit to stand the judgment of that great day which shall be revealed so as by fire. It will also be made apparent to all, that the Presbyterian Church in this country, in inquiring after the “old paths,” and in giving her testi-

* See “Union” by Harris, p. 3.

† See on this subject Anti-Mammon, pp. 276, 283, 312, 320, 322, 324, and 346.

‡ See Anti-Mammon, p. 298, 302, and 326.

§ See Anti-Mammon, p. 312, 326, 328, 333, and 339.

mony in favour of the doctrines of grace, is encouraged in her heavenly work, by the faithful of every church, in every country, who are now under the guidance of the same Almighty Spirit, making a good confession before the world of these very principles as the only "doctrines that be of God."

For an exhibition of the palpable contrast between the doctrines of Mammon and those of the Bible and the Reformers, and their identity with those of Heresiarchs of former times, we must refer to Anti-Mammon.* That there is a perfect similarity between these views and those of some of the new school Theologians in this country, we have had too abundant proof.

We cannot conclude without distinctly avowing our entire concurrence with Mr. Harris in the strongest of his exhibitions of the great evil and sinfulness of covetousness—as we would unite with him in weeping over its most lamentable prevalence. Nor would we withhold the expression of that delight which we have enjoyed in the perusal of many parts of this work, and of our sincere regret that the doctrinal errors commingled with them, have made it imperative upon us, as watchmen on the walls of Zion, to speak out as we have spoken, not against the author of this work, nor against the general aim and spirit of the work itself, but against it, as combining with much that is most commendable, much that in its tendency is most hurtful to the truth.

ART. V.—*Memoirs of Mrs. Hawkes, late of Islington; including, Remarks in Conversation and Extracts from Sermons and Letters of the late Rev. Richard Cecil.* By Catharine Cecil. From the second London Edition. Philadelphia: J. Whetham. 1838.

ALTHOUGH biography is undoubtedly a species of composition which combines profit with entertainment, in as great a degree as any other; yet, it must not be supposed that

* See particularly, "The Analogy," "The Witnesses," and "The Decision."

† We would not dismiss this article without commending the work of Mr. Treffry on Covetousness as a very able work. It is published by the London Tract Society, and was, we believe, one of the rejected Essays.

every kind of biography is read with advantage. Like every other species of writing it is liable to abuse, and some productions which belong to this class, are amongst the most insidious and corrupting which exist. Just as great as is the difference of the effect of a truly good example and the contrary; so great is a difference between a description of the one and the other.

Some persons, however, seem to take it for granted that all religious biography must of course be good, and the reading of it profitable; but this is far from being true. Much of this class is absolutely worthless. It teaches nothing; or what it does inculcate, is adapted to injure rather than benefit the reader. Even biography of pious men and women may be of no real value, and the time spent in reading such works, wasted. As it is an easy kind of authorship to weave a narrative of incidents out of the journals, or letters, of a pious man, or woman, many persons venture into this field, and the consequence is, that the public is inundated with the lives and memoirs of persons, pious and well-meaning, it is true; but, such as should have been permitted, after performing their work upon earth, to rest in peace. Memoirs of weak and fanatical men and women, in which we have the fumed froth of religion, instead of its solidity and spirituality, do incalculable evil. A large portion of religious professors are exceedingly liable to be affected and influenced by narratives of this sort; and are often led off in an erratic course, much to their own injury, and the discomfort of those with whom they are associated. According to the prevalent method of preparing works of this kind, the writer has little to do, but to select from the materials before him, and scarcely appears in the work. The subject of the memoir is made his own biographer, by means of his letters to his correspondents; or by his private diary, where he has recorded his feelings, and also the passing events with which he has been connected. We like this method of biography, because it enables the reader to judge for himself of the talents, disposition, and motives of the person: it admits him into the very secret chamber, and even into the secrets of the heart, of one who has acted a conspicuous part on the theatre of the world. This, at least, is the fact, when the person, in penning his letters and journals, had no secret view to the possibility that they might, one day, be exposed to the eye of the public. When we consider the deceitfulness of the human heart, even in good men, and how secretly and in-

sidiously vanity works, we shall not be surprised at the suggestion, that the record which a man keeps of his own thoughts and feelings, is not always perfectly honest. He is cautious about writing down the very worst that he even feels stirring within him, lest some other eye should happen to light upon it; and under the same influence, he gives as fair a colouring as he can, to his own motives and actions; mentioning only such as if they should ever come to light, will not dishonour him. In some published memoirs, we have thought, that we could plainly discern the insidious working of this secret vainglory. And often, the only reason why the biography of one is published, rather than that of his neighbour, is, that the materials of such a memoir are found among the papers of the deceased, in the one case, and not in the other. As we have too many biographies, so they are commonly much too long. Nobody now thinks of comprehending the memoirs of any person within any less compass than a volume. To swell the work to the due size, a great deal of matter is often introduced, which had much better been left out; and of that which is truly excellent, we often have much more than is necessary, to exhibit the true lineaments of the character intended to be portrayed. That must be, indeed, a person of uncommon character, whose Christian experience requires more than a few pages to set it forth, in all the variety of forms and exercises of which he may have been the subject. Too often, the publication of journals or diaries, for years, is a tiresome repetition of the same thing. The writer of memoirs seldom exercises a sound judgment in selecting the things which should be presented to the public. The partiality of friendship leads him to think, that the public will feel the same interest in the private concerns of the subject of the memoir, which is felt by the writer. And very frequently, private concerns are disclosed which ought never to have seen the light. It is to us matter of astonishment, that so little regard is paid, by surviving friends, to what would be the wish of the deceased, if he could be consulted. Retiring, modest persons, who shunned the public gaze, are by their indiscreet friends, dragged before the public, and their most private and confidential papers exposed. This has induced some distinguished persons to take care, to have all their papers, which they are unwilling to have published, destroyed, before their death.

The observations which have been made above, do not apply to public men, whose biography is intimately con-

ned with the times in which they lived. But it is undoubtedly true, that many biographies will perish from the fact of their being too voluminous. Though well written, they are read by few; or if read when first published, soon sink into oblivion, whereas, if they had been confined to a moderate size, they might have continued to be read and published for a long time to come.

It is almost our only objection to the memoir before us, that it is too much extended; although there are some domestic troubles brought to view, which, in our judgment, ought to have been left in the privacy to which such matters properly belong. In regard, however, to the character here exhibited, it is exceedingly to our liking. Mrs. Hawkes was a Christian of the right stamp. And her firm and elevated piety was combined with a fine understanding, highly cultivated, and well stored with useful knowledge. A jewel is precious any where, but when encased in gold appears to best advantage. The piety and intelligence of some of Mrs. Hawkes' correspondents, are of the same exalted and refined character as her own,—especially, is this the case with Mrs. Jones, her sister. There is an originality of conception, a soundness of judgment, and a delicacy of taste, as well as a pure strain of spiritual feeling pervading the letters of this lady, which cannot but conciliate the esteem of the pious and judicious reader.

Mrs. Hawkes, though the child of eminently pious parents, spent her youth in gayety and fashionable amusements. While moving in this giddy circle of pleasure, she attracted the attention of a gentleman of fortune, to whom she became united in marriage. But though considered "a good match," by the world, it was, as is often the case with such marriages, far from being "a happy match." Her severest trials arose from a quarter from which she should have derived her sweetest enjoyments. No details of her domestic sufferings are given; but the subject is frequently hinted at in her journal.

This volume interests us much more than common, because it brings us into further acquaintance with a man for whose character we have long felt the highest veneration: we mean, the Rev. Richard Cecil. Few men, in our judgment, have exceeded this evangelical clergyman, in deep penetration, an original vein of thought, and pure spirituality, in his religion. The little volume of his "Remains" would be poorly appreciated, by saying, that it was worth its

weight in gold; and yet these choice sayings and sententious aphorisms, we have heard, were secretly collected by a friend, without the knowledge or suspicion of the author. As little did he suspect that his conversations with Mrs. Hawkes would ever be communicated to the public. But here we have his free opinions on various religious topics, just as he uttered them; and they are so remarkably like what we already have of this truly great man, that it would seem impossible that they should have proceeded from any other.

It has already been mentioned that Mrs. Hawkes' early life was spent in the fashionable world. After her marriage and settlement in London, she was visited by her sister, Mrs. Jones, who resided in Birmingham, and belonged to the parish of the Rev. Edward Burn. This gentleman requested her, while in London, to take an opportunity of hearing Mr. Cecil. Accordingly, she invited her sister to accompany her to St. John's Chapel, where they heard this man of God, deliver his Master's message. The impression made on Mrs. Hawkes' mind was deep, and abiding. "She entered into the sanctuary as a woman grieved in spirit." She returned thence no longer sorrowful, but with new and powerful impressions of the efficacy of Scripture consolations: and with earnest desires to become a partaker of spiritual blessings. From this period, she constantly attended St. John's Chapel. But so retiring was her disposition, and so peculiar her domestic situation, that she made no communication of her feelings, to the venerable preacher. It was not until two years after this event, that her sister, Mrs. Jones, herself pious, took the liberty of writing a note to Mr. Cecil, and requesting him to visit her sister. This visit, Mrs. Hawkes considered an important era in her life. She writes in her journal, "Feb. 17, 1789. A DAY TO ME VERY MOMENTOUS. I look upon myself to day, as having entered the list of public professors of Christianity." The account which Mrs. Hawkes has preserved of this first interview with Mr. Cecil, cannot but be interesting to the pious reader. She begins with an account of her feelings from the time of hearing him preach.

"For many years past I have been much stumbled by marking the spirit, temper, and conduct of some professors. This may have been partly from my own ignorance of human nature, and partly from erecting too high a standard for professors in general. For though that religion cannot be *real* which does not in some degree make old things become new, yet I have expected, perhaps, that it should change men into angels. This view, however, has made me to say to myself over and over, if ever I am religious, I will keep it a secret; for I

will never make a profession, lest I too, should fall below the mark, and disgrace that sacred cause. A dread of this has, for many years, made me silent when my heart was at times stirred: but more especially since I first heard at St. John's, two years ago. My mind before this period, was merely transiently impressed, and the impressions wore away, and vanished like the morning dew; but from the first time of hearing Mr. Cecil, I earnestly began to cry out, 'WHAT SHALL I DO TO BE SAVED.'

"During the last two years I have literally 'roared with anguish of spirit.' The arrows of the Almighty have stuck so fast in me. Temptations from the world—temptations from within,—and most horrible temptations or suggestions from my spiritual enemy—have made my flesh tremble. The only thing that seemed to save me from absolute despair and distraction, was the reading Christian's fight with Apollyon; and his walk through the dark valley, in the PILGRIM'S PROGRESS.

"It is generally believed among many of my acquaintance that I am mad. I have been mad with vanity and folly, but I trust that *now* the Lord is bringing me to a right mind.

"Though I have many very godly acquaintance and friends, I could never speak my mind to them; and I durst not speak to my minister, whom I never fail to hear, because of my determination to keep my religion to myself. At length, however, after much sorrow, and many prayers, He that promises help in time of need, sent his faithful and kind messenger to me, the least of all, with words of admonition, comfort, and instruction; which, while they are, I trust, engraven on my heart, I am also desirous to retain in my memory as to the *particulars*: and thus to secure to myself the advantage of often looking them over.

"In conversing, I first named my great and long predominating fear of making a profession, lest I should dishonour God. To which Mr. C. replied,—'Every Christian must meet with difficulties, temptations, and trials; and so will you. But what then? Is not God able to defend you? We, as ministers of the Gospel, greatly rejoice to direct and assist our flock; but in a thousand cases, it is utterly out of our power to do it, even where we are most intimate. You will frequently find yourself *alone* in your journey, and feel that you can turn to no friend on earth for direction. In such cases, you must not be dismayed, but trust in God; and feel out your way like one groping in the dark; take a step at a time.

"On the other hand, take care, when you receive help from any friend, or your minister, that you do not lean too much upon them, nor be too anxious for their support. We are all poor earthen vessels.

"Watch and pray against failures; but take heed of desponding under them. Be content to travel as you are *able*. The oak springs from the acorn; but does it become a tree at *once*? Because the stage waggon cannot travel to York as fast as the stage coach, would you therefore say it will *never* get to York? The mushroom springs up in a *night*; but what is the *mushroom*?

"You must not look for perfection either in yourself or others. Not to allow for the infirmities and defects of a fallen nature, is not to understand any thing about the matter; nay, it is to speak directly contrary to the Bible, the standard of all truth. There never was more than one perfect character upon earth, and he was the most tender and compassionate towards the imperfections of men. He knew what was in man, for he looked at the heart; and if he saw that right, he pitied, where those who judged only by the *outward appearance*, blamed; and defended, where they condemned.

"There is one distinction you should keep very clear in your mind—that religion itself, in its essence, is perfect; as our rule and standard it is unerring; nor can it be affected by the inconsistencies or imperfections of its professors: the standard remains the same: the balances are true: but when its professors are weighed therein,—even the very best of them,—they are found wanting.

Our aim must be to get every day nearer the standard: for whoever does not *labour*, not merely desire, but *labour* to be a better Christian every day, is not yet a Christian at all. Yet in this you must exercise *patience*. Do not measure yourself by a false standard. There are no doubt giants in the Christian world,—but would you be a giant at once? Do not be satisfied to be a dwarf: but remember there must be time to grow.

“*Question to Mr. C. respecting dress.*”

“*Answer:* Religion takes root in the heart, and when it has once got deeply rooted, it will be sure to regulate every thing *without*. It will so occupy the mind, that every thing else will begin to lose its importance. Religion puts every thing in its proper place; and makes present things lighter than vanity. Even business, or literature, or science, if any one of these takes full possession of the mind, it makes dress a very insignificant thing, and often neglected even to slovenliness. How much more indifferent will *religion* make us about it. Nevertheless, it is good to avoid *singularity* of habit. No real Christian can give into the butterfly fooleries and extravagances of dress,—any more than they can run into the dissipation of worldly company. Religion does not bid you turn hermit, but rather to ornament your station.

“Be careful, in your commerce with the world, to act up to the character you profess. Do not put on a Pharisaical manner of, ‘Stand by, for I am holier than thou.’ Yet let it appear, that while you are under the necessity of hearing their vain conversation, you have no taste for it; no delight or interest in it. A humble, kind silence often utters *much*.

“None can pretend to say how far you may intermix in worldly company, and get no stain or soil. Situation, circumstances, &c., must all be taken into consideration. But *this* may be said, that he only mixes with the world with *safety*, who does it not from inclination, but *necessity*.

“As to amusements, and what are called recreations, a really awakened Christian will neither find taste nor leisure for them. Religion furnishes the mind with objects sufficient to fill up every vacancy. Yet as you name them, I would have you mark carefully every thing that *disposes* or *indisposes* the mind to holy pursuits. Persons of tender health are very careful to avoid whatever is hurtful; such as damps—infectious rooms—blighting winds. They attend to the injunctions of their physicians, the cautions of their friends, &c. If people were but as careful about their spiritual health as they are of their bodily health, we should see much stronger and taller Christians.

“Above all, before you become a pilgrim, sit down and COUNT THE COST. Your journey is up-hill every step of the way. You have foes within, ready to join with foes without to hinder, alarm, and distress you. Wisdom *in* the fight, is only to be gained by fighting. If the young convert could learn from the old Christian, what experience alone can teach, he might have a far easier journey; but each one must learn it for *himself*, and often by very painful discipline. Nor must we think our case hard, if we are made to pass through much tribulation; since it is the way of *all* believers—nay of Christ himself.

“No doubt God *could* have led his people by an easier method. But since he has chosen *this*, it must be the best. He could have brought the Israelites into the land of promise by a shorter and a smoother way: but what he did was intended to prove them; to show them what was in their hearts—and to be a lesson to us.

“Take care that you never harbour hard thoughts of God. It is one of Satan’s chief devices, to make you think dishonourably of God. Nothing is more displeasing to God, nor more injurious to the life of religion. See the slothful servant in the Gospel.

“Throughout the Scriptures you see how gracious God is: How he stoops to the poorest creature that comes to him through a mediator: How small an offering he will accept; if there can be *but* a small one. A single sigh from a contrite heart will penetrate his ear.

"Wherever God gives faith he will *try* it ; and whoever becomes a follower of Christ, must deny himself, and take up his cross—must make great sacrifices—such as right hands, and right eyes : must expect opposition, persecution, mortification, cruel scoffings,—not only from the world, but from nearest and dearest friends. A man's sharpest and bitterest foes are 'those of his own household.' You must set your face like a flint against threatenings, and against allurements.

"But I would warn you of another danger arising from a quarter you may least expect—namely, from *THE RELIGIOUS WORLD* ITSELF. There are stumbling-blocks even in the church ; there are many professors, who, when they see a person setting out in religion, will advise, one *this* course, and one *that*. One sort says, 'religion is in its best estate among us.' Another sort says, 'among us ;'—and the young convert, having a tender conscience, desirous of being right, is often greatly perplexed ; for he finds that in the religious world there is a party spirit. Instead of obtaining the *milk* of the word, he has to distinguish between *bones* of doctrine ; till at last he begins to doubt if there be any true spirit of religion at all.

"Do not form too high expectations from the professing world. Do not be in haste to form connexions—to make acquaintances—to place confidence—to turn to every professor and say, *lead me*.

"Do not enter into the list of religious *gossips* ; who may not only puzzle you about hard points of doctrine, but may lead you to waste your time to no purpose, in going from house to house, talking, instead of getting into the spirit of unity. There are too many of this sort ; whose chief religion lies in going from church to church to hear, and from house to house to *prate* ; but who are too seldom in their closets, too seldom in close converse with God. *Retired* Christianity is the *truest*. It is easy to fill the head with notions ; but to sit still like Mary, at Christ's feet, and be a learner, is far better. Always be afraid of a specious religion.

"However high the cost may be of becoming a pilgrim, do not be disheartened. Remember, greater is He that is for you, than he that is against you. The Gospel requires nothing which it does not give you strength to perform. You must either wear Christ's yoke, or the devil's yoke ; and it need not be told you which is the easiest. Godliness is great riches even in this world ; and what shall you share in the next ? If you be heartily on God's side, he will be on *yours*.

"*Ques.* But suppose I should be in the number of such as shall 'seek to enter in, and not be able ?'

"*Ans.* Observe, there is a material difference between one that only *seeks* to enter in—and one that *strives* to enter in. It is said, '*strive* to enter in at the strait gate ; for many shall *seek*, and not be able.' Here *striving* is distinguished from *seeking*. Do not be a listless uncertain seeker : but strive determinately—constantly—earnestly. Be like the merchant, whose head and heart are always on his merchandise. He watches wind and weather—seizes every favourable turn in business. He is all energy—all pursuit—nothing can divert him from his point. They that thus strive to enter in at the strait gate, taking God's way and help, shall never fail.

"But the Christian must *wait* as well as pursue. He must exercise faith and patience as well as diligence. The husbandman waiteth long for the harvest. You must have patience with yourself. You must have patience with God. There is nothing which young Christians are more apt to fall into than impatience. If they do not immediately see an answer to their prayers, they say, 'The Lord does not hear—he does not regard.' Whereas, you must fix your faith in the promise and word of God ; which declares, *he does hear*, whatever appearances may be. He may not answer your prayers in *your* time, but he will answer them in the *best* time. Do not judge from your frames and feelings ; but by the word of God, which says, 'I will hear them that call upon me.'—'Faithful is he that hath promised.'

"*Ques.* How far those persons are right, who insist upon our ascertaining the precise time, and manner, when the pardon of sin is actually received?"

"*Ans.* The best evidence of the pardon of sin, is, that we bring forth the fruits of righteousness. Evidence is the child of experience. Those who talk of sudden and instantaneous assurance, talk at random. Assurance is a fruit and effect of righteousness. It is progressive.

"*Ques.* How far I might, with safety, indulge my strong passion for *music*?"

"Mr. Cecil replied with solemnity, 'You may indulge that as well as every other taste, as far as it tends to the glory of God, and does not interfere with the progress of the soul in divine things.'"

One of the evils which accompanied her unhappy marriage was, that the company who frequented the house, were of a character no how to Mrs. Hawkes' present taste. They were in the habit too of dining at her house on Sunday, and seemed to think that she was "mad," or "a dreadful bigot." Formerly, said they, "she was amiable and obliging," but now, "off to church in the morning—hurry over dinner—off again in the afternoon—then off to church again in the evening." As Mrs. Hawkes had but little domestic comfort, she rejoiced exceedingly in her Sunday privileges. The church was her sanctuary and her refuge from all her troubles. She was also constant in her attendance on Mr. Cecil's Wednesday evening lecture, at Longacre; and valued the privilege so much, that when at any time disappointed in going, it grieved her much.

Her religious state of mind, at this period, will appear very clearly from the following letter to Mrs. Jones :

"This has been a choice morning to my poor barren soul, which for the last week has been tried within and without. But blessed be my gracious Lord, who hath poured water upon the dry ground of my heart, and caused it to breathe forth, longing, panting, desires after *Himself*. I feel the refreshing droppings of his Spirit; and I am constrained to go out after him, whom, having not seen (glory be to his name), I inexpressibly love and adore! Oh, the preciousness of a *present* Saviour: Oh, that he were thus *ever present*! I fear that I am not enough thankful for the goodness of my God. When heavy trials come, I am too apt to be bowed down. Not murmuring, thank God; I think I have not for a long time felt any thing of that: but I fear I am not rejoicing as I ought to be, for the many mercies that are mixed with my great trials. I call upon you to unite with me in praise and thanksgiving; I cannot give words to my full heart for the goodness and tenderness of God to me, the most unworthy of all his creatures. Glory be to his name, that he has graciously caused me to seek, and to find Him;—that by bringing me into his marvellous light, he has afforded me such superior enjoyments, such ennobling *views*, such secret and solid satisfaction; such as, I am sure, never entered into my heart to conceive! Oh, it is all wonder and astonishment, that so much mercy should be bestowed on so undeserving a wretch! But these are the benefits and blessings of redeeming love. Perhaps you will say, I am indulging too high a flight. But who can soar too high, when contemplating the wondrous works of redemption? It is only to you, that I indulge the overflowing of my gratitude; one turn of my conscious eye into my vile *self*, at once awes and chastises my rapture; and tells me, with such favours, how far I am from what I ought to be."

The following letter from Mrs. Jones to Mrs. Hawkes will be perused with pleasure, by every one who has the least tincture of piety.

"I have had many exercises, but God has enabled me to lie at anchor until the storm was over. I have had much to bear within *myself*, but God is a God of *patience*, and therefore he beareth not like man, but like himself. There is no end of his goodness! no, *no end*! We serve a God of love, who accepts our endeavours to please him. He is not extreme to mark with rigour every little failure, but regards the *motive*, and the affections; and saith, 'Let your love be without dissimulation; let that be fixed; and as to other things, I know what is in man, and consider that he is but dust; and on that account I have opened a fountain to wash away his sin and uncleanness. His defilement shall not hinder the exercise of my love towards him; sinful as he is, if he abides in me, (by faith and love,) and my word abides in him, (as the mark to which he aims,) he may ask what he will, and it shall be done unto him.' O that we knew the strength of this promise, 'whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, it shall be done.'

"We may torment and perplex ourselves with this and the other defect; but we must come to God to be filled with his love. He will strengthen us for every good word and work; for nothing is so active, so operative as love, which the apostle fully proves, 1 Cor. xiii. We do not expect enough from this love. It is an *ocean*, and we must cast ourselves into it as well as we can.

"I hope you continue to meet me at the throne of grace at *twelve*. I feel it an animating thought, that we can unite in spirit, though we are absent in body. At the Lord's table, last Sunday, I had a very invigorating view of the love of God. It appeared to me without bounds, and as free as the air we breathe, so that my heart could only cry out 'Lord, *I accept it, I accept it.*' If in our most favoured moments we have sometimes a sight of the love of God, which we can by no means express in human language, O what amazing discoveries shall break upon our souls when they leave these clay tenements! The very anticipation of it is glorious."

The answer of Mrs. Hawkes is so excellent, that we cannot resist the temptation to lay it before our readers.

"I thank my dearest sister for her last letter; it did me good. My aching heart feelingly echoed back your words, 'There is no end of his goodness;' if there were, there would be an end of our hope, for I am sure there is no end of the daily provocations he receives at our hands, at least I can say from *mine*. I seem at this time to be learning deeper lessons of my own utter depravity; and to feel that sin is in every breath I draw,—in every pulse that beats. I frequently cannot open my lips; but am only able to prostrate my spirit before God. I feel that if I ask favours, I shall abuse them; and yet I cannot live without asking more and more. Therefore I can only pray, if there are any in the family of Christ whose case resembles mine, deal with me as thou dealest with them. I have been greatly encouraged lately by the consideration of the wisdom of God, and by believing that what his wisdom undertakes, his love will complete. I see, in some measure, that nothing less than infinite wisdom, power, and mercy, did ever devise or accomplish the salvation of a sinner. I have had some spiritual exercise and temptations of late, which I had not expected; so little do I know of the narrow path. Had I experienced these before my faith was well grounded, it seems to me, I should have been overset. But 'I know in whom I have believed'—and I doubt not, though the combat is sharp and long, and I can only just keep my head above water, by seeing sometimes one promise, and sometimes another, that either in time or eternity, I

shall see the *needs be* for the trials of this part of my pilgrimage. I thirst for more divine wisdom; and if it must be gained by suffering, so let it be, as far as I shall be able to endure.

"However, I can say this, 'If I am not willing to be cured of the disease of sin at any expense, Lord, do it *against* my will: only uphold me during the process. I know what it is to have sharp bodily pains, and can conceive of others still more severe; but all is nothing to that crucifixion of the spirit, which we must pass through. That passage was brought strongly to my mind this morning, 'Satan hath desired to have thee, that he might sift thee as wheat, but *I have prayed for thee.*' Who can be sufficiently thankful for such an intercessor! Through grace I am yet enabled to say, 'Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy;' I shall yet see thy overthrow, and my victory. Through the blood of the Lamb, I shall yet be more than conqueror. And though various trials and temptations from within and without have well nigh shaken to the ground this house of clay, yet I trust I have another provided, 'A house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' Let your prayers, my dear sister, help to waft me thither. I need them much. I thank you for the benefit I have already derived from them: I entreat yet more. I much wish to come to visit you, and hope I shall soon. The *time* I leave to Him who is my guide and comforter, as far as comfort is needful. That I have not more, is owing to *myself*; that I have *any*, is owing solely to the riches of His grace."

In a visit from Mr. Cecil, whom she calls her reverend father in the gospel, he gave her, as he always did, the richest instructions, the substance of which is as follows:

"'Rejoice,' he said, 'rather than despond, at the discoveries you obtain of the deceitfulness of your heart. It may be painful to you, but it is *safe*. Christians must *fight*, not *faint*. Such as get the deepest knowledge of their indwelling evils, are better grounded in religion than those who only see the surface. Observe what views David had of his sinfulness.

"'Take care of reading what is called CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. Very few of such books are well written, *i. e.* have the experience *simply* stated: only mark the difference between the characters given us in the Bible, and the characters usually drawn by *man*. God gives the true, simple account of the character. He writes down the defects as well as the excellences. But when man undertakes to write, he gives the best side of the story; he generally dresses out the character in all its excellence, and casts the defects into the shade. Do not, therefore, take your standard from human observation, but divine. Do not take another person's conscience for the rule of your own; for there are innumerable cases wherein one cannot judge for another. Study the Scriptures with prayer, and a teachable spirit, and you will never greatly err.'"

In 1790, Mr. Hawkes removed to a small house about four miles from town, which was a change exceedingly welcome to the feelings of his wife; for she was weary of the bustle and company of the city, and delighted in retirement, which she hoped she should here enjoy.

Soon after she was fixed in her new residence, she had a visit from her beloved pastor, who spoke to her in the following manner:

"Do not read the Bible with notes only. It is a loss to confine yourself to any commentator. Read it with prayer, and listen simply to the *best Teacher*, the Holy Spirit; who will sometimes so shine upon the word, as to afford you

an insight and understanding of the Scriptures such as no commentator upon earth can give. Then you will not only understand it, but *lay hold* of it.

“Daily observe regular, stated times, for retirement. Let reading, prayer, and meditation, have each their place: each is of importance. Take a verse of Scripture at a time, ponder over it; examine it in its connexion—reference—bearing; try what you can get out of it. Where a preacher might draw many inferences, you may perhaps be able to draw but one or two; but if you persevere, you will every day get more and more from your Bible. If you should find these stated periods sometimes formal and heavy—yet go on—do not be discouraged—you will, upon the whole, obtain much benefit: for whoever makes a serious inquiry after religion, will always meet with an answer from the gospel.

“*Ques.* Respecting withdrawal from the world.

“*Ans.* Christian courage does not consist in a disposition to retire from the world in absolute solitude; but in mixing with it, and yet living above it; in being *in* the world, but not *of* it; in making a bold stand for Christ; being as the salt of the earth. Yet retirement, at certain seasons, should be secured. We should endeavour to preserve such a spirit in society as to make us relish retirement; and so improve retirement, as to make us useful to society. Our troubles arise not from our living in the world, but from the world living in us. One part of the world is that of inordinately coveting the praise of our fellow-creatures.

“Endeavour to go into the world, as far as you are *called* so to do, putting honour upon your Christian profession; and if any ask you a reason of the hope that is in you, tell them meekly, ‘*It is the blood of sprinkling.*’”

Although the subject of Mrs. Hawkes’ domestic difficulties is frequently alluded to; yet nothing more than brief hints are given, as to the nature of these trials. It seems sufficiently evident, however, that she was united to a man who was not only irreligious, but unkind; and from her censures of herself for not possessing more self-command and exercising more uncomplaining meekness, we may infer, that his conversation was, at times, not only harsh, but reproachful and irritating. This is undoubtedly a delicate subject to be brought before the public; and many will think had better been covered with the veil of oblivion; but it is evident, that without some reference to these domestic trials, many of her religious exercises cannot be well understood. The condition of a pious, sensible, and refined female, who is subjected to the dominion and unkindness of a proud and unfeeling man, whose ingenuity is exerted to render the anguish of her whom he is bound to love and cherish, more poignant, is to a mind of exquisite delicacy, one of the bitterest cups of affliction, to which human nature is subject, in this vale of tears. It is a distress, the more intolerable, because it admits of none of the usual alleviations, from giving vent to sorrows, and experiencing the tender sympathy of friends; for this is a grief which commonly must remain locked up in the breast of the innocent sufferer. It must be a rare case,

when it would be prudent to reveal the sorrows of the breaking heart to the most confidential friend. Mrs. Hawkes did, indeed, suppose, that as Mr. Cecil was her spiritual father, and constant counsellor, from whose conversation she had derived so much instruction and consolation, that it would be allowable for her to express her smothered griefs to such a friend. In this, however, we are of opinion, that she misjudged; and we are confirmed in our judgment, by the conduct of this man of wisdom. For when, on a certain occasion, she alluded to her domestic trials, her pastor, in a manner bordering on the austere, repressed all further communication on this delicate subject. Pastors who open their ears to complaints of wives against their husbands, however justly founded, clearly manifest their want of a deep knowledge of the human heart. On another occasion, when the same subject was distantly alluded to by Mrs. Hawkes, his answer was accompanied with an air of so much severity, that, as appears by the record in her journal on the occasion, her feelings were deeply wounded, for she understood him to insinuate, that, probably, she might blame herself, at least in part, for what she endured.

Under the pressure of increased trials, Mrs. Hawkes wrote the following letter to Mrs. Jones:

"I am sorry to find my dear sister like myself, infested with many anxieties, though of a different nature. *Mine* have been very heavy indeed of late. For some time past, I have not been enabled, (in the degree I have been graciously assisted heretofore,) to roll back my burthen on the Lord. But he saw me ready to faint, and mercifully vouchsafed me timely help. Let none fear trouble with such a compassionate Saviour for a sustainer; for verily he is not an High-Priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but who hath a condescending and tender sympathy with us under them; which he will manifest in the time, and manner, and measure, which his infinite wisdom sees best. As for me, I am quite ashamed of myself; truly it may be said, 'If thou faint in the day of adversity, thy strength is small.' Small, indeed, is my strength, or rather, feeble is the hold which faith takes of an Almighty arm. I am willing to allow, (for who is not willing to make self-excuses,) that my trials are peculiar, and my present bodily weakness and languor does much towards enfeebling the mind also; yet I have still much to be ashamed of. Our great business in life is to glorify God, and to speak abroad his praise;—and the fittest time to do this is under suffering. It is easy enough to sing when the sun shines: but when the heart and flesh fail, then to rejoice in the Lord, becomes the true servants of so good a Master. In the grave the tongue is silent. It can no more publish to fellow-sinners, and fellow-sufferers, that 'The Lord is good, a strong hold in the day of trouble;' and that his tender mercies are more in number than the sand of the sea. It is therefore the living only that can praise him; and of all living, the *afflicted* believer, whose every trouble is sanctified, has reason to be loudest in the song."

To which Mrs. Jones returned the following answer:

"It is a mighty conflict; and if you had not an Almighty Friend to hold you up, your heart and flesh would fail. But he will strengthen your heart, and enable you to fight manfully. He has brought you into these trials that you may raise an Ebenezer to his name, and bear testimony to the truth, and write *tried* under the promise, 'As thy day is, so shall thy strength be.' God will prove his beloved ones, that they may be constrained to prove him. A good man used to say, that the same Almighty power which made the world, was also granted to the Christian. You have an anchor that will hold you fast. It is sufficient at such times as these, to endure, as seeing him that is invisible. By and by, you will reap the pleasant and peaceable fruits of these afflicting seasons and exercises. What a happy day will that be when this mortal shall put on immortality! but we should be willing to fight before we are crowned; and the Apostle says we do not fight '*uncertainly*.' Even the most unpleasant vacuities in life have their uses; we must be made to feel what we are—poor fallen creatures—that we may be thankful for that grace which transformeth us into a better image. The knowledge of our weakness must ever be attended with painful sensations; and I apprehend that we shall ever be increasing in that knowledge as long as we are in the body. But the more we feel our disease, the more shall we prize and apply our remedy. May you, with the strong arm of faith, be able to lay hold of the Saviour, till he perfect his strength in your weakness. I endeavour to bear you before him, and to entreat his mercy. I would not prescribe to him who loves you in connexion with your eternal interests. It is indeed difficult to believe that all this is for the best: but we cannot read God's dispensations aright; they are too high for mortals to spell them out. Faith and resignation are written in the most legible characters: may we consider them well; and may Jesus Christ work them in us."

The following meditation, recorded in her journal, contains a plain allusion to her domestic trials, and is the only thing which we shall insert on this painful subject:

"Whither should mourners go for consolation, but to the sanctuary? 'My soul melteth for heaviness, strengthen thou me, according to thy word.' My soul is pierced through with many sorrows, and this has been a day of severe outward conflict. Had I looked to the strong for strength, and kept my mouth as with a bridle, and acquitted myself like a good soldier of Jesus Christ,—it would have been only *outward*; but failing in this point, the enemy has gained great advantage over me; and my mind and frame is thrown into a ferment not soon to be allayed. It has long been my earnest desire, to fill up my several relations in life, especially *one*, as unto the Lord. I have been anxious that I might never dishonour my Christian profession. I have been anxious to obtain domestic happiness, which I have thought my disposition and heart formed for. I find, however, from repeated disappointments, that I must live by faith. I must look, not at the sword, but at the hand that holds it. I must say, this and that severe stroke is not from man; but from my heavenly Father, who 'scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.' (Heb. xii. 6.) I am well persuaded that a Christian ought to evidence to all around, that he has the love that 'beareth all things; is not easily provoked;' or what difference is there, before man, between him and a tinkling cymbal? And where is the glory that he should render to God? And what sign is there of gratitude for the saving love of Christ? And what conformity to his suffering master? 'What do ye more than others?' I will therefore, instead of saying, 'It is impossible,' pray for that grace that can enable me to do all things;—things contrary, and hard to flesh and blood. I may, and I fear I shall fail to please man: but my Saviour is not an hard Master; if I labour to please Him, I shall not fail; his favour will bear me up under my disappointments, and strengthen me to endure.

"'Tis good for me to wear the yoke,
For pride is apt to rise and swell;
'Tis good to bear my Father's stroke,
That I might learn his statutes well."

It always affords us pleasure to introduce any thing from the lips of Mr. Cecil. This volume is as truly a memoir of this excellent man, as it is of his disciple, Mrs. Hawkes.

"July 1.—Was favoured to-day by a visit from my honoured minister. 'There is no such thing,' said he, 'in the Christian life as *standing still*. If we do not get forward, we must loose ground. If a child should be no larger in its growth at eight years old, than it was at four, we know at once that there is something the matter. So it is with the soul; if the graces of the spirit do not grow and flourish, there is some latent cause which calls for examination. If our love to God, to his word, to his ordinances, to his people, does not increase, and if our love of sin, and love to the world does not lessen, it is a sign we do not grow in grace. If we do not gain a greater mastery over ourselves, our tempers and affections, our bad habits, than we had at our first setting out in Christianity, we surely do not grow in grace.

"'Never expect much of the joy of the Holy Ghost, if your heart and mind be occupied in the enjoyment of sense. The joy of the spirit is a delicate, sacred deposit; and must be kept in a pure casket. An unholy breath will dim its lustre, and fade its freshness. The joys of sense—even the most lawful of them—are agitating, tumultuous, and unsatisfactory. The joy of the spirit is calming, modest, strengthening, elevating, and satisfying. The joys of sense, at the best, enervate, lower and impoverish the soul. The joys of the spirit enoble and enrich it.'

"At another time Mr. C. observed, 'They who would yield unreserved obedience, when they know what the will of God is, must neither be influenced by carnal affections, nor listen to plausible objections, nor consult partial counselors; nor make any delays; but committing all to the Lord's hand, must simply follow the pillar and the cloud.' May I be a follower of them, who, through faith and patience, inherit the promises!'

We cannot deny our readers the pleasure of reading the following excellent letter from Mrs. Ely Bates to Mrs. Hawkes:

"Brompton, Feb. 22, 1793.

"MY DEAR FRIEND,

"You will permit me to call you so, because you have been already such in some respects, and I trust you will be more so to me: I mean that I shall give you occasion to do me more good. The chief good I want, and would beg you to help me to obtain, is, to climb up from present to heavenly things, '*To be spiritually-minded is life and peace*;' *life*, which enables for action, and *peace*, which strengthens by rest. I have lost ground by an over-attention to *little things*: therefore if I mean to profit by you, I see it is my duty to watch when we meet, against entering on the detail of common life, and rather to endeavour to get strength, by union with you, to climb upwards, and get near the feet of that adorable Saviour who is not only the 'Saviour of the body,' his Church, but of our bodies as distinguished from our souls, and who can shed his salvation into all the smaller works of our life: as, under the law, all the vessels as well as the people, were sprinkled with blood. Heb. xi. 19—21. My dear friend, I am lower down than you think; (and I entreat you not to consider this as the language of humility;) I want *practical* comprehension, that

I may not give undue importance to trifles; *theoretical* will not do. The understanding works at leisure, distinct from the habits and passions of the whole man,—like a candle before it enters the damp of a coal pit. Pray for me, that my mind may become more spiritual, that I may get nearer to God, watch more unto prayer, and cultivate more quietness of spirit.

“I received yesterday a visit from a Miss D——, who lives in Hornsey lane, Highgate, and it occurred to me that you might be made useful to her. She was last year in Switzerland, and brought me a letter from a friend there, which was the occasion of her call. Her stay was short, but she took that time to open to me, in some measure, the state of her mind, and the concern she was under respecting her soul. It seems she has an aunt in Manchester, a pious woman, with whom Miss D. had been staying for some months on a visit, and it appears to have been made a blessing to her. But she now stands alone and expresses herself desirous of some help. I thought I would mention it to you, and if you felt yourself disposed to give her the opportunity, she would certainly be very glad to see you. I think it is not desirable for young persons in her state to have many religious acquaintances; they had better be wholly secluded than dissipated: her strength must stand in prayer and retirement. She cannot enjoy many opportunities of hearing the truth preached; and certainly her calling is rather to be faithful to the openings of Providence, than pass over a wall, or break through a hedge. I cannot think but that, in general, much loss is suffered, and harm incurred, by too hasty steps of that kind. I believe that where a heart is simple, and attentive to divine grace, all that is needful will be given in due time and season. But we obscure the light, and lose our docility, by overpassing the bounds of providence. Yet it is natural for persons in her case to look around and say, ‘*Come and help me.*’ Happy if they who come, direct them simply to the great Shepherd: such escape many stumblings and offences. I have only room to add,

“I remain, my dear friend,

“Yours affectionately,

“E. BATES.”

In the year 1794, Mrs. Hawkes went forward in her usual religious course, and judging from her private diary and letters to her sister, she made rapid progress in knowledge and piety; and experienced the hidden pleasures of communion with God, in no small degree. Mr. Cecil, her faithful friend and pastor, furnished her mind with abundance of salubrious nutriment, in his sermons, on which she not only fed with zest, at the time of their delivery, but treasured them up for future use. About this time she commenced putting down, in writing, the substance of all the sermons which she heard from him; and thus the leading thoughts of a number of the sermons of this eminent servant of Christ have been preserved from total oblivion, and are published in the appendix to this volume. The only event which occurred, this year, to give her much uneasiness, in addition to her domestic troubles, was the severe and dangerous illness of Mrs. Cecil, a very excellent woman, for whom as well as her husband, she had formed an intimate friendship. This, however, afforded her an opportunity of manifesting her affection for

this excellent family, by tenderly sympathizing in their sore affliction. But it pleased God, contrary to the fears of all her friends, to restore Mrs. Cecil to her family, and to her health.

The next year, 1795, Mrs. Hawkes was called to meet adversity in a different shape; for scarcely had she entered on the new year—which she always did with solemn reflections and devotional exercises suited to the season—than she herself was brought down with a sickness, by which she was confined two months. During the remainder of this year and a good part of the next, she made few entries in her journal, but the few which are left, breathe such a spirit of humility and self-abasement, as proves that she was growing in grace. She continued, however, to record Mr. Cecil's sermons; and especially his remarks in conversation, when she was favoured with a visit from him. We prefer extracting these when they occur, rather than her report of his sermons, because we are of opinion that they are more excellent; at least, they are better suited to our taste.

"*Thursday, 5.*—Was favoured by a visit from my revered minister. His conversation has left a solemn effect upon my mind.

"Mr. C. observed, the attacks made upon the soul by sin and Satan resemble waterfloods surrounding a house, and incessantly working in at one place or another. No sooner is one inlet secured, than the water makes its way in somewhere else.

"Satan is a constant enemy, never ceasing to buffet us; but whatever bows down the soul, we must bring it to Christ, whether the attack be from the world, the flesh, or the devil.

"Nothing tunes the soul like *prayer*. He that is able to go and plead his case with God, shall soon 'mount with wings as eagles; shall run and not be weary; shall walk and not faint.' We should pray for a spirit of prayer; we cannot expect a favor we do not ask for. I am persuaded that God will honour *every species* of prayer. It is a sad thing to let the devil persuade us to stand still, or go backward, because we cannot do all we wish.

"Prayer is the key that unlocks every blessing. Beware of *general* requests; it is a sign of a cold, unfeeling heart. Come and specify what you would have; carry your *real* concerns to Christ; and be satisfied with his care and management of you. The government is upon *his* shoulders, not *yours*. It is enough that he undertakes for you; therefore transact all your affairs with him. A Christian who is sometimes found *sitting still* as a man of *faith*, is at other times found *wrestling* as a man of prayer.

"There are a vast variety of corrections for the people of God. One is sorely tempted; another has great outward losses; another is visited with sickness. The form of the chastisement is of small importance; but each feels the weight, and is touched to the quick; and *that*, perhaps, when those who stand by, see nothing of the affair. To *endure* chastisement is to receive it as to the *design* of it; to take it *willingly*. The manner of our receiving chastisement, will throw great light upon our character, whether we are, or are not the sons of God. Sorrow is a fire: but while it is a purifying fire to some, it is a consuming fire to others. The primitive Christians were remarkable for their

patience under suffering. God can make a man as quiet by faith, as if there were no danger at all. But a frown from God is ten thousand times worse than a stake or gibbet.

"In all dispensations we should be careful not to lose the *benefit*, either by falling into a state of despondency, or by being inattentive to our feelings and sentiments in the affliction; or by impatience under it. Endeavour to keep the presence of God in your heart through every circumstance.

"Learn to distinguish between humiliation and gloomy depression. What St. Paul means by being crucified to the world is not a peevish quarrelling with it, but a noble victory over it. While we say of laughter, 'It is mad,' let us beware of running into an unscriptural melancholy. The enemy has often made use of this great success to the injury of religion. Holy joy is the proper antidote.

"As Christians, it is our privilege to be going on to perfection; to walk free from mists and uncomfortableness; and though, while here, we shall to the end, only 'see through a glass darkly,' yet we are directed to fix our eyes upon a more perfect day, when the 'wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament.'

These remarks, we think, are precisely adapted to the case of multitudes of conscientious, sorrowful Christians. And as we have an excellent letter from this profoundly judicious pastor, on the same subject, addressed to Mrs. Hawkes, we cannot deprive our readers of the benefit of perusing it.

"MY DEAR DAUGHTER,

"The uneasiness I feel when I see any thing which I think amiss in you, obliges me to write a letter, though you know I am no writer of letters except when absolutely compelled.

"Now as you are a fruitful plant in my vineyard, and one that I have had the honour and pleasure of planting, I cannot be satisfied if I suspect any injury whatever which may impede your growth.

"But I do suspect an injury. I do think I see one enemy, and that, an enemy at the very root of your health and comfort:—It is a little mischievous worm called melancholy. It is engendered by constitution and ill health; and makes both worse. I say this from experience; but then what is only accidental in my case, is almost constant in yours; and I cannot but observe this with great pain. First, because I do not think you are sufficiently apprized of the evil. It strips you of the only ornament of the Christian profession I ever saw you want,—I mean a permanent joy and peace in believing. I know you have such humble views of yourself, that you will consider me a very partial judge: but on this subject, I cannot think I am incompetent to judge; and I do not allow myself (I humbly hope) to say what I do not really think.

"I know every thing that occurs is capable of wounding a sensibility such as yours. But the world is nothing to you. Come, I will give you a bit of an old man who writes better than I can:—

"'We may compare an afflicted believer to a man that has an orchard laden with fruit, who because the wind has blown off the leaves, sits down and weeps. If one asks What do you weep for? Why my apple-leaves are gone! But have you not your apples left? Yes. Very well, then do not grieve for a few *leaves*, which could only hinder the ripening of your fruit.'

"Pardons and promises that cannot fail, lie at the root of my dear daughter's profession; and fruits of faith, hope and love, that no one can question, have long covered her branches. The east wind sometimes carries off a few leaves, though the rough wind is stayed; and what if every leaf were gone? what if

not a single earthly comfort remained? Christ has prayed and promised that her 'fruit shall remain;' and it shall be my joy to behold it through eternity.

"Past eleven o'clock, and time for poor sleepy preachers to go to bed. But I shall sleep better for having dropped a word or two, though it be but saying old things over and over again.

"But the morning cometh, a morning without melancholy. To-morrow morning, you and I shall walk in a garden where I hope to talk with you about every thing but sadness; and if I even forgot, and began upon the subject, you would immediately reply, 'Sorrow and sighing are fled for ever.'

"So they do *now*, as faith is in exercise. I received amazing benefit from Hill's tenth sermon, on 2 Kings iv. 26. 'She answered and said, It is well;' which I read walking home from you yesterday. I went and bought the book, and shall return you yours directly, and beg you will go through the same sermon, and pray that it may be as much blessed to you as it was to me.

"With kindest regards to Mr. Hawkes,

"Believe me your very affectionate Father,

"R. CECIL."

The afflicted often think that the cup of their sorrows is as full as it can hold, and that they are incapable of suffering keener anguish than they have already endured: but little do they know the hidden sources of grief which may be let loose upon them.

Perhaps Mrs. Hawkes suffered herself to be too deeply affected, and too much cast down, by her domestic troubles. In the midst of all, she enjoyed her religious privileges without restraint, and lived in affluence, and at her ease. But now a cloud arose from an unexpected quarter to darken her horizon. Her husband, by permitting a friend, deeply engaged in speculation, to draw upon him at pleasure, irretrievably lost his whole estate: and even the little country seat, in which Mrs. Hawkes so much delighted, was obliged to be sold. Indeed, she was now left in a state of total dependence, and without a home. This was a species of affliction of which she had never dreamed; having always been accustomed to independence and affluence. Many others, however, have been called to suffer in the same way; especially in these times of fluctuation in trade. It is not wonderful, that in these circumstances, Mrs. Hawkes was much cast down and afflicted; but, no doubt, this new trial was intended, and worked for her good.

What rendered the stroke more severe was, that her own private fortune went with the wreck of her husband's estate; for he being considered a man of good property, and not in trade, no settlement had been made on her. This calamity also fell upon her when her health was in a declining state, which rendered her less capable of bearing up under such a pressure of adversity; so that, for a while, she sunk into a

deplorable melancholy. Still, however, she held fast to the covenant of her God, and rolled her burdens on his arm.

Her husband having some openings which appeared favourable in Portsmouth, Mrs. Hawkes resorted to that place to join him. And while here she had a very narrow escape from drowning, while bathing in the sea.

Being now entirely destitute of a house or home, Mrs. Hawkes knew not what to do, and in a letter consulted her kind friend and pastor. Mr. and Mrs. Cecil were then at Batterssea, where Mr. Henry Thornton had kindly offered them the use of his house. In this kind family there was neither reluctance nor hesitation in inviting Mrs. Hawkes to take up her abode with them.

In the following reflections entered in her journal about this time, there is a strain of tender, devout, and sorrowful feeling, which cannot be read without emotion.

"Feb. 10.—'When my father and my mother forsake me, the Lord taketh me up.' This I am sure has been my experience. In a dreadful tempest that has swept away all my pleasant things. God has graciously provided a shelter for me, and found me the kindest parents, brothers, and sisters, friends, in the whole world. Nothing can equal the tenderness I experience every hour of the day in this Christian house. I am ashamed and confounded that I am not more thankful :—that my heart so steals to its former much-loved haunts. How many have my afflictions, without my mercies !

"'When I would comfort myself against sorrow, my heart is faint in me.'

"Oh my sweet home !—my lovely fields !—my secret chamber ! How often have I fled like an affrighted bird to your sacred retirement !—how often poured out tears of anguish, and received comforts which the world could neither give nor take away !

"I thought myself more secure in my home, because it was given me in a time of deep trouble, and in answer to many prayers :—because, in the best manner I could, I dedicated it to God ; and promised that, as far as I could ensure, it should never be made the reception of the gay and the giddy.

"Witness ye solitary walks ! ye walls and beams of my chamber ! if I took any delight in you equal to that of holding sweet intercourse with an unseen, but to me, gracious and present God and Saviour ! My pleasures were sacred pleasures ; and such as made large amends for my troubles. I had much leisure, but always found the day too short for my employ. Beloved spot ! how can I bear the thought of giving it up ! my imagination visits every corner,—counts every pane of glass ;—nothing is too minute to be remembered. Rather let my recollection retrace my former dedication, when I first took possession of that retreat, and mark with shame my deviations. 'Behold the Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save ; nor his ear heavy that he cannot hear.'

"I endeavour to call to remembrance some of my *bitter* things at Holloway. I had many, very many ;—but the bitter was so much sweetened by manifold mercies, that I ought to have felt nothing but thankfulness : whereas, I often murmured.

"Great trials prove what strength we have. I have been greatly deceived in myself herein ; and have thought far more highly of myself than I ought to think : for I thought, that because I was enabled to weather the trials and troubles I then had, with some degree of courage, and even through all, generally,

to go on my way rejoicing, that I did great things; and that whatever might befall, I should never be cast down, or affrighted. But now where is my strength? It is very weakness. Now where is my triumph? I am become dumb. Evermore after this, I must lay my hand upon my mouth. It is easy to be joyous in sunshine. I fear I have been very prone to self-conceit and high mindedness.

"The flesh is ready to cry out, 'It is hard:' such a one, and such a one, is exempt from my afflictions, they dwell among their own people, and can lie down at night upon their own pillow, none making them afraid. But woe beto me, if after all the experience I have had, Satan prevails to make me think my Saviour a hard master. No! whom he loveth he chasteneth. It is not for a *sinner* to say, Why may I not have this or that? and therefore, it is not for *me*. My afflictions are far less than I deserve, and my mercies far above my highest expectations.

"Never say, I have no propensity to this or that particular failing,—stay, till that trial or temptation comes, to prove it.

"In recollecting seasons and scenes that are past, the pleasant things only are present to the mind; the painful are forgotten, or leave but a slight impression. The conviction of this, should be moderate present grief."

While at Mr. Cecil's, and confined to her chamber by sickness, the Rev. John Newton paid a visit to his friend, and hearing, while at dinner, that Mrs. Hawkes was sick in bed, he said to Mrs. Cecil, "You should have told me of this before," and immediately arose, and went to her room, and prayed with her. When he returned to the company, he said, "Great characters are not made by walking on carpets."

Mrs. Hawkes spent the months of June and July with her sister at Birmingham; from thence she went to Weather-oak-hill, the seat of her late brother in law, Mr. Mynors. In her diary, while at this place, she makes the following remark. "Retirement tells us what we should be, but active life tells us what we are." From this place she went to Cowes. While residing here, she received an affectionate, cheering letter from her pastor, accompanied with a cordial invitation to return to his house. She was also visited at Cowes, by a female friend and relative, Miss Mary Milward, a young lady of eminent piety, who has since been called to her rest, after a long and honourable Christian course, maintained under severe bodily sufferings.

Mrs. Hawkes was now literally a sojourner; for though we find her, in the beginning of October, at Cowes, when her mind seems to have been calm and comfortable; yet in the close of the month, she is again at Portsmouth. And the only entry in her diary at this place commences with the bitter language of Job. "Even to day is my complaint bitter, my stroke is heavier than my groaning." In November, Mrs. Hawkes returned to London, nor to enjoy repose,

but to suffer a new and sore affliction, in the dangerous and long continued sickness of her dear pastor, and disinterested friend. 'This painful dispensation lasted three months; at the end of which time, it pleased God to restore Mr. Cecil to a state of convalescence, and enabled him to resume his public ministrations.'

Mrs. Hawkes was not permitted long to enjoy the company of her friends in London; she was called away again, first to Cowes, and then to Portsmouth; and back again to London; all in the space of a few months.

About the year 1799, Mrs. Hawkes' habitual health began to be deeply affected with a disease which gave her constant pain, and deeply affected her spirits; and which is now known to have been an internal tumor. This year, in her frequent change of place, she spent some time at Southampton, at which place we find her making the following pleasing record. "June 24th. I am here greatly favoured by the kind notice of that eminent servant of God, the Rev. John Newton. His conversation and his sermons partake of the same holy, dependent, child-like spirit. I trust I shall be permitted to make some stay in this place, while such advantages are afforded me."

The necessity of constantly removing from place to place, to suit her husband's affairs, was exceedingly uncongenial to Mrs. Hawkes' disposition, who delighted in quietude and retirement. "What a scene of changes," says she, "is my present life. The lodging to which I this week removed, is the *sixth*, since I left Little James street." Towards the close of the year 1800, Mrs. Hawkes again visited her sister, Mrs. Jones, at Birmingham, and spent several months with her. We find on pp. 165, 166, two delightful letters, which not long after, passed between these two lovely sisters; but our limited space precludes their insertion.

In 1801, we find Mrs. Hawkes again an inmate of Mr. Cecil's family, where her privileges were great; but the fear of being a burden to these good people, who loved her as a child, preyed constantly on her susceptible mind. Her health also became every day, more precarious, and many symptoms seemed to threaten speedy dissolution. It being necessary that she should reside in London, for the benefit of medical advice, and that she might be near to her sympathizing friends, Mr. Jones came up to the city, to arrange matters for her comfortable accommodation, out of Mr. Cecil's house. The object was accomplished to the satisfaction

of all, by getting her a place in the family of Mr. Collyer, a pious member of Mr. Cecil's charge who had married Mrs. Hawkes' neice. Mrs. Cecil, indeed, could not be said to be reconciled to her friend's leaving her house; she felt that her society was a loss not easily to be repaired. The feelings of this generous, excellent woman, may be learned from an extract of a letter, addressed to Mrs. Hawkes after her departure.

"I confess to you, my dearest sister, there is but one rich gift I covet, and that is, that you might be thrown into my lot, to live and die with me and mine. This would be no impoverishing circumstance: I could only view it as a certain increase of my own and my childrens' inheritance. I have sometimes thought this might be; and then I have seen why I had a house large enough to receive you, as well as a heart fully ready to meet this favour. And I have thought also, that even were I taken away, I should leave you among my children, as their guardian and friend.

"I most cordially thank you for your letter; I cannot express how much pleasure it afforded me. I scribble a line now, and for my apparent neglect have one plea which I hope will be accepted, namely, having had eighteen in family for some days past. Ah! I never have so many as not to regret that I have not *one more*! One, whose society has afforded me more real pleasure than all other I ever enjoyed.

"I am grieved to hear, both from yourself and others, of the increase of your pain. You have need to look to a better country, where pain, and sorrow, and sighing flee away—as I know you do. Nevertheless, I am aware how delicate a recipient of sympathy you are, and I feel a sad regret that I am unable now to render you more than sympathy; for I am not content to offer you only that which you must receive from every common friend."

We have also an excellent letter from Mr. Newton, dated Nov. 18, 1802, which we cannot omit.

"MY DEAR MADAM,

"You are now removed out of old seventy-eight's track, and therefore I must try my poor eyes, which are very weak, to send you a small token of my love upon paper.

"We must through many tribulations enter into the kingdom of God: so our Lord has forewarned us, but he adds, 'In me ye shall have peace.' Tribulations, both you and I have felt, and still feel; but I trust at the bottom of them all, we have peace within, from the knowledge of our acceptance in the Beloved, and His gracious promises of strength, according to our day; and that He will, in the final event, make all things, whether sweet or bitter to the flesh, to work together for our good.

"Though 'man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward,' none of them spring out of the ground. They are all to God's own people, under the direction of infinite wisdom and love. If we are 'in heaviness,' there is a 'needs be' for it,—whether we know it or not. For He who so loved us as to die upon the cross to free us from the curse of the law, will not inflict any unnecessary pain on those whom He has taught to put their trust in Him. Some of our afflictions are medicinals, to check that worst of maladies, indwelling sin,—or to prevent a relapse: and though, at present, they are not joyous but grievous, we know not how much worse it might have been. If you had always remained as you were when I first knew you,—or I, as I was three or four years ago, Satan

might have lulled us asleep upon 'the enchanted ground.' But the Lord in mercy sent something to rouse us. Our path has been rough, but I trust it will be safe; and we shall one day say, 'Happy affliction, which brought me nearer to my God, or prevented any wandering from Him.'

"Again, sometimes the Lord honours his people by appointing them a great trial. As He has given them to believe in his name, so also He gives them to 'suffer for his sake.' So far as he enables us to support affliction with cheerful submission, patience, and hope,—so far the post of trial is a post of honour. Thereby the reality and power of religion, the power and faithfulness of our Lord in supporting and relieving, is exhibited to his glory, for the encouragement of believers and the conviction of gainsayers; and we ourselves are taught more and more of the vanity of creature-dependence, and the all sufficiency of our great and unchangeable Friend, who has promised, that 'If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him.'

"Let us cheer up, madam: the time is short, and shortening apace. Every pulse we feel, beats a sharp moment of the pain away; and the last stroke will come: then heaven will make amends for all. I commend you to the Lord's blessing. Dear Miss Catlett, though not quite well, is better than when she first came home, and is again a great comfort to me. Pray for her, and for

"Your affectionate,

"JOHN NEWTON."

From this time Mrs. Hawkes was, for the most part, confined to her chamber. And her valued privileges in the house of God, in which she so much delighted, were entirely cut off. But the loss was made up by the benefits of affliction. And a new sphere of usefulness began to open before her, in the opportunity of assisting, by her conversation and instructions, many younger Christians. She took much delight in the society of young persons, to whose affections she found easy access, by the sweet and social temper of her own mind. One after another resorted to her for the advantage of her counsel or encouragement, and thus, by degrees, her religious acquaintance became extensive. She became also very useful to several inquiring young females, by her correspondence as well as her conversation. Specimens of her letters to such, are given in this part of the volume.

In 1803, it was judged advisable that Mrs. Hawkes should, for reasons connected with the nature of her disease, return again for a season to Mr. Cecil's house. During the time of her residence with this pious and hospitable family, her diary is replete with accounts of spiritual conflicts, and comforts. Her faith and patience had evidently approximated nearer to perfection, under the purifying fire of the furnace, in which she was placed. We could fill many pages with choice morsels from the diary and correspondence of this excellent woman during several years, which we must necessarily pass over.

In 1811, Dr. Fearon, her esteemed friend and physician, of-

ferred Mrs. Hawkes a vacant parsonage-house, at Betchworth, in Surrey. Here she remained four or five months, and then returned to London. After her return, apartments were obtained for her at Penton Place, where it was judged the air was drier and more suitable for her, than at her niece Collyer's. In this lodging she continued from 1812 to 1817. In the early part of the latter year, Mrs. Hawkes had an attack of nervous and bilious fever, by which her frame was greatly debilitated. For the sake of a change of air, she was removed to Clapham, where she remained only a few months. Still while the outward man was perishing the inward man was renewed day by day. Her reflections, recorded in her diary at this time, are as spiritual and heavenly, as any thing on earth can well be. When she returned to London, she did not resume her former lodgings, but suitable apartments were found in Queen's Row, Pentonville. In these she continued to reside for eleven years, in the same bodily debility; "but strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might."

The correspondence between Mrs. Hawkes and Mrs. Jones became more frequent and more heavenly, during the time of the residence of the former, at Queen's Row. Mrs. Jones, in one of her letters, says:

"Oh that I could sit by the side of my beloved sister, and talk of the glory we expect on the other side of Jordan! We are not looking at a land which we may, or may not, reach; but our hopes are sure and certain, of a land that is not far off. We are upon the borders, and in daily expectations of a messenger to convey us over; and we have a friend ever present, who has engaged to go with us all the way through. Oh! the multitude of weary pilgrims that are groaning in their way! but everlasting rest sounds sweetly in their ears. *
* * * * * If I should be favoured with sudden death, look at me in a better world with Christ in God; and suffer not your mind to dwell upon the clay tenement. Christ is mine, and I am his; and to see him as he is, is far better than to dwell in this dark abode: * * * * *
Tell me of the supports given you by the Lord in your afflictions. May the Holy Spirit abundantly supply you with the riches of your inheritance, and with still further views of the glory which shall be shortly revealed: or if your faith is tried, may you be able to say with your suffering Saviour, 'Thy will be done.'"

To which Mrs. Hawkes replies in a style no less animated:

"Although my sufferings increase, yet, blessed be God, he maketh my consolations in himself to increase also; and I humbly hope I may say, from favoured experience, I *do* feel they are now working together for my good. I endeavour to cry with earnestness, that I may be 'strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering, with joyfulness.' What a progression! The common ills and occurrences of life need 'patience;' but these, increased by peculiar and long-continued afflictions, call for 'long-suffering.' And what is the top-stone? 'Joyfulness!' And how is this to be

obtained? 'By his glorious power,' giving strength according to our day. 'With all might.' What does that mean? We shall know 'if we follow on to know the Lord.' When I read the glorious truths of the gospel, my mind is overwhelmed with their richness and fulness; and I cannot help stopping at every one, and using the words of that departed saint, Mr. Foster.* 'What does that mean,—and what does that mean!' Lord! teach me by thy Holy Spirit what thou meanest. Take all impediments to my learning out of the way; all ignorance, error, unbelief, conceit, and vain imaginations; and fill this poor, feeble, dark mind, with thy light. Let not the eyes of my understanding be confined within any boundaries of time and sense; let them not be drawn down to means and creatures, to second causes, and human contingencies; but fix them abidingly on thyself, the great First cause, the Governor of heaven and earth; the invisible, eternal, ever-present God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom I live, and move, and have my being. Am I afflicted? It is a Father's gentle correcting hand. Am I in want? He knoweth it, and says, 'The world is mine, and the fulness thereof.' Am I in the valley of humiliation? There grows the lily of the valley; and there, blessed be the God of all grace, have I found that Lily, and derive thence such invigorating sweetness, as none but myself can know. Would I exchange my pain, my restless nights, nay, even my sometimes heart-sinkings, with the alternative of losing these heavenly bestowments? No! not to be made empress of the world. These are but means of pulling down the walls of the prison-house, from whence the captive spirit shall soon wing its way to those realms of bliss, which it is now exploring with feeble faith, and strong desire. I need not say, O my dear sister, fix your eyes there,—for there they *are* fixed; and there we shall shortly meet, to smile at our poor, narrow conceptions of that glory which it has not entered into the heart of man to conceive."

At this time, Mrs. Hawkes appears to have been peculiarly favoured in her Christian experience. Long exercised in the school of adversity, she now began to realize in a larger degree, those "peaceable fruits of righteousness," which are the effect of sanctified affliction. Her growth in humility, resignation, and acquiescence in the divine will, was more and more apparent. There was also afforded her, great comfort and enlargement in reading the Holy Scriptures, in the diligent study of which she found increasing delight.

In her journal, January 1818, she observes, "Some of my acquaintance are ready to reflect upon me, because I can feel so cheerful and so happy, circumstanced as I am in a certain relative point of view. And well they might reflect, and censure also, if I had *any joy*, but what cometh from God. In the Lord, in his word, his ordinances, his providence, his grace, and in his children,—is all my delight; and in these, I, in a measure, lose my griefs. O, blessed be his name, He has chosen me for himself, and given me grace to choose Him; and give myself to Him; and I am satisfied and re-

* The Rev. Henry Foster, minister of Clerkenwell.

joiced: His name and his word are the rejoicing of my heart." It is probable, that her husband had long since forsaken her, as we hear no more of him; and to this she no doubt alludes in the above remark. But it is worth while to hear her further. "The God of all mercy and grace, in the last two years, condescended in a special manner to be very near to my soul, and to draw me with the cords of his love, into a nearer union and intercourse with himself. My heart is so won by his grace, that it knows not how to bear his absence, when he withdraws himself; and my cry is, and ever shall be, when I cannot see him, 'Return thou fairest among ten thousand.' At the same time, the manifestations of his grace and goodness, are attended by such discoveries of my wretched heart, and a depraved nature—of my past sins, and present vileness—that my sorrow and shame are equal to my hope and joy. At the foot of the blessed cross, these different feelings are called forth, and sweetly blend and harmonize. There I learn to understand, in some degree, that Christian paradox, 'As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing.' " To her beloved sister, she says, "Language is too weak to express the peace that I experience, in knowing whom I have believed, and being fully assured, 'that he will keep that which I have committed to him to that day.' Unto Him, by the help of his grace, do I commit myself, in pain and ease—in suffering, whether it is short or long:—in life and in death. He gives me such reviving consolations, as fill me with wonder, praise, and humiliation; and supports and comforts me with one hand, while with the other he gently lays his fatherly rod upon me. 'Bless the Lord, O, my soul, and all that is within me, bless his holy name.' How delightful will the haven be, after these rough winds."

To a young friend, on the subject of reading the Holy Scriptures, she says, "In thus reverently studying the Divine character, our minds will obtain larger apprehensions of the various perfections of God; and the discoveries, which the Holy Spirit will enable us to make, will cause our hearts to burn within us; our faith, love, and confidence, will be increased, and a fresh interest will be given to every thing needed, because we shall trace every thing *upwards*. 'Here I see the touch of his hand.' The more we behold of piety, the lower we shall sink in humility, and self-abasement; and selfishness—hateful, narrow selfishness, will be lost."

"What I have found to be my stay through every dark and dismal cogitation, is, to get my memory staid with scrip-

ture. When thoughts rush in, I do not parley with them, but instantly read, or repeat, some verses of the Bible, where I always find an answer for every thing. . . . And when mixed with faith and prayer, effectual to perfect, establish, and settle the soul, in peace. Every passage I read, and meditate upon, furnishes me with so many distinct topics for prayer. This I do find to be the secret that obliterates the power and being of second causes: this fills up every aching void in the solitary heart: this turns the wilderness into a pleasant garden; unravels all dark problems, and teaches us to be good arithmeticians, 'to reckon that the sufferings of this present time, are not to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.' "

In the year 1820, Mrs. Hawkes was called to part with her beloved sister, Mrs. Jones. This put an end to a most delightful and spiritual correspondence; and severed another of those cords which binds the heart to earth. Mrs. Hawkes, though naturally extremely susceptible of grief, had now come to view heaven so near, that she was less affected with this event, than would have been supposed.

Mrs. Hawkes' natural vigour of mind, and strength of constitution, had wonderfully sustained her under long continued sufferings; but, at length, nature began to give way, and every prop to sink from under her. To a friend, she writes, "My beloved friend would wonder to see, how old, and almost helpless, I am grown; yet, when I am seated on my couch, and in converse with my friends, no great alteration (I am told) appears to a common observer; for through great mercy my spirits are good, and my mind is kept in peaceful waiting for the longed for permission 'to be absent from the body and present with the Lord.' A few weeks past, I thought I had obtained leave to depart, but the gold had more dross to be taken away, ere it could be fitted as a pure vessel for the Master's use. Decaying, sluggish nature shrinks from the purifying fire, but as far as it is recovered, it tries to say, 'The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it.' "

In 1823, Mrs. Hawkes had to lament the death of one of her sisters, Mrs. Mynors; with whom, however, she appears to have had much less spiritual intercourse, than with Mrs. Jones. But the former being left in affluent circumstances, was able to afford Mrs. Hawkes an annuity while she lived; and, at her death, made provision for a larger allowance than she had given in her life time. Her disease, which had been for

some time stationary, began now to grow evidently worse; and her nerves became exceedingly debilitated and deranged: but still her confidence remained unshaken, and her peace and hope was a constant cordial to her spirits; and in the midst of all her afflictions, she was constantly endeavouring to be useful, especially to her numerous circle of young friends. Providence did not leave her destitute of friends and benefactors during her long confinement. In several instances she received important and necessary aid, bestowed with such delicate regard to her feelings, that she never knew from what source these bountiful streams issued.

The reader may be surprised to hear no more of the kind attentions of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil to their suffering friend. They were both gone to their rest, Mr. Cecil first, August 15, 1810, and Mrs. Cecil a few years afterward.

As late as August 1830, we find a long and interesting letter from Mrs. Hawkes, addressed to the Rev. R. Waldo Sibthorp, who had requested a particular account of her religious views and experiences. After an introduction, in which she expresses her gratitude to this reverend gentleman, for the interest which he took in her spiritual concerns, she goes on to say:

“An attack of disease in the head has rendered writing, and reading, and even much thinking, not only exceedingly difficult, but also dangerous in its consequences: and has proved a fresh occasion for the exercise of passive faith, and sweet repose in the will of God, and in his fatherly love and compassion; in which I am ashamed to feel I am so much wanting,—but which, I trust, I am seeking to obtain in a way which you, dear sir, kindly point out,—that of not resting short of a fuller measure of the blessed spirit of adoption; by which at all times, and in the darkest seasons, I may cry, ‘my Father, my Father!’ I say a *fuller* measure,—for I surely am not wholly a stranger to this high privilege,—these most sweet drawings of the blessed Spirit to the bosom of a compassionate Father,—even while under the deepest smartings of his chastening rod. Yet I am conscious that the spirit of bondage is not cast out as it ought to be; but is still striving to rob my soul of that *abiding* peace, which is the sweet fruit of ‘a full assurance of faith.’ I would, therefore, in self-renunciation, prostrate myself at the foot of the blessed cross,—the holiest, safest, and happiest station for all the soul’s transactions with God,—and would earnestly enter into the inquiry, ‘Is there not a cause?’ It may be partly from the want of such serious inquiry, that many sincere Christians rest short of this crowning blessing of the gospel. In my own case,—setting aside a proneness to legality, and many other causes that operate to produce gloomy doubts,—I seem every day to be made to discover and feel, that I know very little of what is *real Christianity*, either in understanding or practice. And having been led, I trust, by Divine teaching, and also by sad experience, to feel somewhat of the exceeding sinfulness of sin,—as regards its own hateful essence, as well as the havoc and ruin it has actually produced, and still does produce in the soul,—my mind and thoughts more frequently revert unto, and dwell upon, what sin hath wrought,

than on that glorious salvation, which hath provided a full and free deliverance therefrom. This habit of my mind arises not so much, I think, from the want of clear views of the precious doctrine of justification, (as revealed in the Scriptures) as from weakness of faith, which hinders a full embodying thereof,—if I may so speak. The faith of affiance in Christ, has, for many years, been so very precious and binding to my soul, that I have seemed only to desire more and more of its uniting power,—whereas I ought, doubtless, to have been pressing forward to the obtaining of the ‘full assurance of hope,’ and the blessed grace of adoption.

“In reply, dear sir, to your kind inquiry, ‘what is the leading relation in which I am wont to keep God before me,’—I humbly trust I may say, that I have been favoured with some sweet communion with God, in each of the sacred relations, in which he has been pleased to reveal himself, in the blessed Scriptures, towards his chosen and called ones. Yet strange to say,—in that of a *Father*, the most endearing of all relations, (as I now begin to discover,) I have not, as I ought, obtained a *distinguishing* acquaintance; or a habit of near and abiding intercourse,—as in other the relations; nor have I, in reading the Scriptures, sought out, and especially marked, the character, the various discoveries which are made therein of God, as a *Father*,—so much as in the light of a Redeemer, and Sanctifier, and in some other sacred features, which I have been accustomed to place before my view; but have rather been expecting that the Spirit of adoption should be given by some immediate and sensible operation of the Spirit, which, with an invincible power, should at once cast out the Spirit of bondage, and overcome all slavish fear; instead of expecting, and waiting for this blessed Divine work to be wrought through the patient searching of the Scriptures and prayer. Surely does all this prove, what I have said before, that I know very little of what real Christianity is, either in understanding or experience;—while, as to its real value and blessedness, I hope I do know something, and find a hungering and thirsting also to know all the fulness thereof.

“I have endeavoured, dear sir, with simplicity and confidence, to meet your very kind wish to know somewhat of my Christian experience,—in the hope of obtaining the further aid of your prayers, and valued counsel; from which, I thankfully believe and hope, I have received much benefit. I think, in the last conversation I had the favour of holding with you, I observed, that though I could not speak *boldly* of my assurance of going to heaven, yet that I was not exercised with *doubts* on that score. And now that I am every day reminded, by some fresh symptom of disease, that there is but one step between me and death, I am, through infinite mercy and favour, enabled to seek, and find, a hiding-place in Christ, so as to venture my all into his arms of faithfulness and love; and to adopt that holy cry, ‘Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly,’ and take to thyself a sinful worm, ‘whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood.’

“The death of my old and beloved friend, Mrs. Cecil, has brought a lowness on my spirits that I am not able, in my present feeble state, to overcome. The loss of animal spirits is to me a new trial; although I am quite aware that it chiefly originates from physical causes, and only affects the mind in a way of sympathy. * * * * *

“I must continue to comfort myself that, though absent, I am not forgotten; nor prevented from meeting you in spirit, in the presence of Him who is the blessed centre of true happiness. I can truly say, I am never at a loss for songs of praise. Your undeserved kindness, my dear Sir, as regards my spiritual and temporal benefit, is among other mercies and favours, that tune my poor harp to cheerful strains of grateful thanksgiving. Much do I long to add on the subject of my deep obligation: but I know unto *whom* you would rather I should pour out my acknowledgements, which I am sure will be accompanied by earnest supplication, that the presence of Christ may be with you always, and prosper

you in every way that you take, public or private; for He knoweth the way that you take.

“With unfeigned respect and esteem,

“I remain, Rev. and dear Sir,

“Your ever obliged,

“SARAH HAWKES.”

It will be unnecessary to enter into any further details respecting the various sufferings, and frequent removals of this excellent woman. It is wonderful that she should have lasted more than thirty years, after manifest symptoms of an incurable disorder had appeared.

The last effort of her pen, is a letter dated Aug. 3, 1832. It may be considered the dying note of this eminent Christian: except that with a tremulous hand, very shortly before her death, she wrote two short prayers. At the close of the first she says, “Let an afflicted, defenceless one, who ever in trouble flies to thee, abide beneath thy spreading wings.” Yea, “under the shadow of thy wings, will I make my refuge, until all my calamities be overpast.” In the close of the second, we have almost her latest breath, “Come, O blessed Spirit of promise, bring, and seal some word of Scripture on my heart, and memory, and it shall be sweeter than if an angel spake.” Her prayer was answered. “There was not much said in that chamber of death. All was solemn—all was silent—save when the dying child of Adam uttered a groan—save, when the living child of the SECOND ADAM uttered a prayer. But there was no one, in that sacred chamber, who was not sensible that the Lord was there. The High and Holy One who inhabiteth eternity, was with this lowly, contrite one, to revive her heart, and her spirit. His everlasting arms were underneath the sufferer. All was peace; and the beams of the Sun of righteousness were shining through this chamber of death; for all was love—love to God, and all the saints. Heaven was drawing nigh, and hope was going forth to meet it; and faith had laid her soul, like a passive infant, in the arms of her Saviour.” When life appeared to be nearly extinct, Mrs. Hawkes was informed that a letter had arrived from her valued friend, Mr. Sibthorp; containing a kind and generous assistance to her bodily comforts; she called on one who was watching by her bed to write, while she dictated. This last effort of the dying Christian, though broken and interrupted by the pangs of dissolution, breathes the same spirit of faith and devotion to God, and the same lively gratitude and love to her Christian friends, which she had long manifested. After

waking from a doze, she again spoke, and among other things, said, "Wash me from all self-righteousness—from all notions that there has been any thing in me but wretchedness and sin"—"I believe my faith has been a right faith—Satan has been permitted to thrust at me—but I trust I am able to say, 'In very faithfulness and righteousness He does it all.' And now I cast it (self-righteousness) all away—I cast myself on Him,—take me as I am,—make me as thou art;—And if it may please Him to give me strength to endure."

Her dissolution, owing to the iron strength of her constitution, was attended by extreme pain, and much convulsive agony; but her mind remained unclouded to the last. Her departure occurred, October 15, 1832.

The Rev. Mr. Fell, in her funeral sermon, preached at Islington, says, "It has been my comfort, my privilege, my joy,—I may add, my honour—to visit Mrs. Hawkes, from the commencement of my residence, at Islington; and with only one exception, I have found her, "patient in tribulation, rejoicing in hope, giving glory to God—smarting, indeed, under a rod of bodily suffering, which I can only describe as a constant martyrdom; but, "glorifying God in the fires."—The exception which the preacher mentions, he thus describes, "On the 23d of September (1832), I received a message, requesting me to visit her—I hastened to her sick chamber. To my grief and surprise, I found her mind bowed down to the very depths of painful disquietude; unable to realize the presence of the Saviour, and harrassed with the fiery darts of the great enemy. But the very next day, if not the same night, she was again enabled to cast all her care on Him who cared for her."

The excellent young lady, who has favoured the Christian world with this admirable biography, has contrived, through the whole narrative, to keep herself very much out of view. It cannot, however, be otherwise than gratifying to the pious reader, to learn, that the author of this volume is the daughter of the excellent Cecil. And she appears, indeed, to be a daughter worthy of such a father. Sometime before we had the opportunity of perusing the "*Memoirs of Mrs. Hawkes*," we recollect to have seen in a letter published in the *Episcopal Recorder* from an American clergyman then in England, an interesting narrative of Miss Catherine Cecil's taking the manuscript of this "*Memoir*" to the venerable Simeon, to get his opinion of the work, and of the expediency of publishing it. This father of the evangelical clergy of the Church of Eng-

land, was himself at the time drawing very near to the end of his pilgrimage; but having heard a part of Mrs. Hawkes' memoir, he continued to call for the reading of the remainder even until his last day; expressing his highest approbation of the sentiments; and evidently deriving sensible comfort from the Christian experience of this lively, spiritual and devoted servant of the Lord. Such an attestation, at such a time, and from such a man, is a stronger recommendation of the volume before us, than we are capable of giving. And having occasion to mention this excellent man, we take pleasure in saying, that in our opinion, evangelical religion and the foreign missionary cause in England, have been more effectually promoted by the labours of Mr. Simeon, than by any individual who has lived in the age which has just gone by. His memory is blessed; and shall be held in everlasting remembrance. "AND I HEARD A VOICE FROM HEAVEN, SAYING UNTO ME, WRITE: BLESSED ARE THE DEAD WHICH DIE IN THE LORD."

ART. VI.—*Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Genesis; Designed as a General Help to Biblical Reading and Instruction.* By George Bush, Prof. of Heb. and Orient. Lit. New York City University. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: E. French. 12mo. pp. xxxvi. 364.

PROFESSOR Bush needs no introduction to the public in general, nor to the readers of our journal in particular. That he is one of our most indefatigable scholars, is evident, not only from the growing number of his publications, but from the disposition which he manifests, to reproduce his old books in a more beautiful and perfect form. While we are waiting for a second edition of his Hebrew Grammar, so extensively re-written as to be in fact a new one, he presents us with a handsome and convenient metamorphosis of his notes on Genesis.

Professor Bush's characteristic qualities, as a commentator, whether good or evil, may, we think, be traced to one great merit and one great fault. The merit is, that, whatever he writes he writes *con amore*. His heart is in it, as well as his head. While he, no doubt, has a due regard to reputa-

tion and to the just emoluments of literary labour, it is plain to every reader, that his governing motives are neither mercenary nor ambitious. He seems to take delight in those very processes which, however necessary in the art of book-making, are commonly regarded as most irksome and laborious. The good effect of this is, that nothing is slurred over, or omitted through neglect; and that the composition every where exhibits marks of freshness and vitality, as far removed as possible from the dead and alive manner of most compilations. A bad effect, resulting from the same cause, is, that the pleasure which he takes in his researches often blinds him to the real value of the product, and leads him to regard a thing as highly important only because he had the pleasure of discovering it. And this effect is aggravated by the characteristic fault which we designed to mention : an apparent incapacity or indisposition to appreciate the different degrees of probability, in weighing proofs or arguments together, and a consequent tendency to mistake the possible for the probable, and the probable for the certain. Some of our author's expositions would appear to indicate it as his principle of exegesis, that what may be the meaning is the meaning. To this end has contributed, we think, a strong desire to find new solutions of vexed questions, which, however laudable, must, if carried to excess, pervert the judgment. No one who glances at the exegetical history of certain hard places, can fail to be struck with the general agreement of the greatest intellects. If the ayes and noes, on certain of these dubia vexata, should be recorded in parliamentary form, we believe that there would be a clear and almost constant party line between the ingenious and the fanciful on one side, and the profound and comprehensive on the other. That a large proportion of the philological learning would be found among the former, is indeed a fact, and one which seems to lead to the unwelcome conclusion, that we must depend on one set of writers to find out what the sense of scripture may be, and on another to determine what it is. Certain it is, that upon some important parts of scripture, all the minute and accurate philology of modern German critics has thrown far less light, than the perspicacious logic of the older writers. It is a great mistake to imagine that the German grammarians understand the Bible better, as a whole, than the logicians of the sixteenth century. Exactness in little things must be combined with large and comprehensive views of great ones, or the most accomplished critic will be

constantly tempted and betrayed into extravagances. Without this combination, much learning will only make him mad. If Professor Bush has placed himself too far upon the wrong side of the party line in question, it is certainly not for want of adequate resources and abilities. We leave it to himself, and to the public to determine, whether his ingenuity, acuteness, and invention, have not, in many cases, been exalted at the expense of his judgment and his powers of ratiocination; and if so, whether these things ought thus to be. What we have thus far said has reference to Professor Bush's published works collectively, and some of our remarks are, perhaps, less applicable to the work before us than to some which have preceded it. The two cardinal excellencies of this volume will be found in the apt illustrations drawn from oriental sources, and the happy combination of critical matter with sound practical reflection. Portions of the Pentateuch, where men are exhibited in the peculiarities of primitive intercourse, are hurried over in common reading, and perhaps, with an effort of imagination, are now and then vaguely conceived. But when we are introduced to a race in actual existence at this day, among whom similar modes of expression and habits of life have been transmitted in stereotype from earliest dates, we seem to enter into the narrative with new spirit and delight. We can almost see the venerable patriarch, sitting in his tent-door, at the heat of the day, or running to meet the celestial visitants, and bowing himself in respectful deference to the unknown travellers. That portion of the 18th chapter which records the generous hospitality of Abraham to the angels on their way to the devoted cities of the plain, is most happily illustrated. The simple narrative itself has a claim on the admiration, but the unassuming grace of patriarchal manner, and the instinctive generosity of Abraham, are exhibited by the Notes before us, in their most attractive aspect. The dulness that attaches to things long obsolete and antiquated, is signally removed, and scenes enacted in the infancy of our race, are brought to view in all the vividness and warmth of actual existence. In selecting materials for this important department, the author has had recourse to some of the most eminent Eastern travels, quoting frequently from Sir Robert Ker Porter and Roberts, occasionally from Belzoni and Madden. He has drawn however, most largely, upon the treasures of the 'Pictorial Bible,' a work prepared at great expense, and recently published in London. To this he owns himself "indebted

for some of the choicest extracts with which his pages are enriched."

We pass to some notices of the critical department which may substantiate our introductory remarks.

Under Gen. xxi. 31, commenting upon (Shabha) 'to swear'—he remarks that "it comes from the same root as the word which signifies *seven*," and "as the original root of the latter has the import of *fulness, satiety, satisfaction*, it may be that it is applied to an oath as the *completion* or *perfection*, the *sufficient security* of a covenant, that which made it binding and *satisfactory* to each of the parties." The common root to which allusion is made can be none other than (Sabha) which we have been wont to regard as quite another word from (Shabha) under consideration, and wholly unconnected with it as a radical form. The author's own words in another connection force themselves upon us. "If one should like the Ephraimites utter Sibboleth, when he meant Shibboleth, it would of course lead to misunderstanding, dispute and division." Yet in charging him with the inadvertence of neglecting the same distinction, it is no part of our design to pass him off for an Ephraimite, though it be greatly important now-a-days to discriminate in the use of terms. We have been accustomed to observe as real a distinction between the letters (Sin) and (Shin) as between the English monosyllables employed to designate them; and we conceive no other ground than the similarity of the letters, upon which a mutual dependence can be asserted. We should regard it quite as warrantable to deduce (Shabhar) 'to break in pieces' from (Sabhar) 'to meditate, explore,' yet we know of no connection in meaning, equally plausible, with which the affirmation could be recommended; except, perhaps, it be, that *meditation* or *invention* sometimes *breaks* "the harmony of thought."

A satisfactory reason for the association of the number 'seven' in Hebrew with the verb *to swear*, is found in the fact that this was a *sacred* number; hallowed by the rest of the Creator, and the attendant institution of the Sabbath; identified in a measure with the sanctity of the day which it was employed to designate. Accordingly we find throughout the Scriptures many instances in which it bears a sacred import; as in Josh. vi. where, at the siege of Jericho, *seven* priests were commanded by God to bear before the ark *seven* trumpets, and the *seventh* day to compass the city *seven*

times—and at the *seventh* time to shout as the walls of the city should fall, thus impressing all the arrangements with the stamp of *divine origin*, and prompting the acknowledgment from a victorious army, “*the Lord hath given us the city.*”

As an oath was taken *in the name of God*, the individual swearing thus, presumed to involve the divine veracity in the transaction, and make the Almighty a party in the covenant. So that, as Hengstenberg remarks, he who swore to a lie—who proved false to such an engagement, did, *as far as in him lay, make God a liar*. We see the propriety, therefore, of covering in the very designation of the act an allusion to its divine relations and to its rare solemnity.* And this expedient would seem an effectual one, if we estimate the prevalence and force of the association among a people who habitually devoted to God a *seventh* portion of time, and to whom every recurring *seventh* day and *seventh* year would invest the number with new sacredness. Its corresponding use in the ritual also must find its true foundation in this feature of popular sentiment and feeling. The uniformity of its selection in the minute prescriptions of the ceremonial law, where a definite number was to be specified, does in fact recognize the previous existence of such an association in the minds of the people. The sprinkling of the blood and oil, so solemn in its import, received additional solemnity from its *sevenfold* repetition. Levit. iv. 6, &c.

To the same hallowed acceptance of the number in popular opinion must be referred the analogous use made of it in prophetic symbols. The *seven* kine, and *seven* ears of Pharaoh's dream (Gen. 41)—the *seven* steps of Ezekiel (40: 22, 26)—the *seven* shepherds of Micah (5: 5)—the *seven* lamps, *seven* pipes, and *seven* eyes of Zechariah (3: 9. 4: 2), the *seven* evil spirits of our Saviour's parable (Matt. 12: 45), together with the *seven* stars, *seven* candlesticks, *seven* churches, *seven* angels, *seven* spirits, *seven* thunders, *seven* vials, *seven* plagues, and *seven* seals of the apocalypse, all find a similar explanation; and surely we are left at no loss to account for the connection of this number with the designation of an oath, and the solemn act of swearing.

* Considered thus, its derivation would convey the same import with that of the Latin noun “*Sacramentum*.” The Sanscrit, like the Hebrew, clearly allies the verb ‘to swear’ “*schaf*” with the number *seven* “*sap-ta*”—Lat. *sep-tem*.

In his comments on the opening of the Mosaic history Prof. Bush discovers no little solicitude to accommodate the theories of modern Geologists; and none can fail to perceive the effort with which, in a few instances, the inspired text has been *translated* out of its legitimate bearing with this end in view. The unqualified remark upon the word 'created' under Gen. i. 1, wears somewhat of a revolting aspect. "It is a matter," says the author, "rather of rational inference, than of express revelation, that the material universe was *created out of nothing*." We are indeed reluctant to conclude that while he chooses to depart from the received understanding of the first verse in the Bible, he would deny us the clear scriptural testimony against the eternal existence of matter. He cannot have forgotten the passage, Heb. xi. 3, which so explicitly asserts that all things were spoken into being by the "word of God," and "*not made of things which do appear*." This is to our minds sufficiently express, while passages such as Prov. viii., where Wisdom gives the testimony of an eye-witness, are no possibly less conclusive. The author deduces it as a truth most unequivocally evidenced by *reason*, but she is not the wisdom of the Bible, nor can we admit that revelation has left us without the distinct and clear announcement.

The sentiments of the commentator on the substance of the verse are embodied in the following paragraph. "Allowing then that the materials, the primordial elements of the heavens and the earth, were brought into existence at an indefinitely prior period, the term 'create' may be understood as expressing the action of the Almighty agent upon the rude chaotic mass in moulding and arranging it into its present comely order." We would apply the term 'create' in this verse, to the *former* operation, and make the passage allude to the *primary* movement. If, as is here granted, the shapeless materials were produced by the divine energy from non-existence, whether at the opening of the first day or at some distant period of the eternal past, we ask, is it not natural to suppose that an inspired narrative of the creation would embrace this important fact? Would it not seem strange that the secondary statements should be furnished in detail, and the great fundamental matter be passed by? That we should be told minutely when and by whom these elements were modified and fashioned, and be left to *reason* for the interesting and momentous information *whence* all things

had their ORIGIN? And that, especially, when so much weight is attached by the inspired writers to this sublimest exertion of Almighty power,—that of creating from non-existence—as distinguishing the only true God from the vanities of the heathen, (Is. xlv.)

The fact adduced by the author that such a force of the verb is not sanctioned by usage, would establish nothing in substantiation of his view, since, evidently, no use distinct from the present would occur for expressing this precise shade of the idea. And certainly the application of words from a lower sense among men to a more exalted bearing in reference to God, is not unheard of, or unreasonable. Terms which, in their common acceptation, express an attribute in a finite degree, are used of Jehovah as involving an infinite measure of the same. We ask then, will the strictest adherence to philological rule pronounce that ברא cannot, in this connection, signify *to create out of nothing*? That no word in any language conveys precisely this idea, would easily arise from the nature of the case. Men, in ordinary intercourse, have no occasion for a term to express an action of which they have known no parallel, an operation confined to this individual instance. On the other hand, the inspired penmen uniformly borrow from familiar discourse, words which, in their application to Jehovah, instantly assume a loftier and more exalted import. It is in this manner that they describe his existence, and speak of his perfections, and not by coining for each specific occasion of the kind, terms wholly peculiar. The context is depended on with safety for the proper modification of the general idea. And, in the case before us, it is from this quarter that we claim for the verb a force such as we advocate. Since, moreover, the special exercise of Divine power in question, is, on both sides, admitted, and the dispute is upon the probability of its *statement here*, we ask which is the more natural presumption? We contend that its expression would furnish just such an idea as we reasonably look for at this point of the Mosaic account.

Nor would this view conflict at all with “ascertained geological facts.” We pronounce not upon the precise period referred to by, “*in the beginning*,” as fixing the date of such a *special* omnipotent act. The author may assign to it a chaotic indefiniteness, or leave the modern science to fix, by laboured computation, the year and day of the work, before old time was born. The phrase naturally refers the

reader to the incipient stage of material existence—whether at the opening of the first day, or far back in the ages of a past eternity—when the rude materials were first ushered into being, which during the creative week were wrought into the comely fabric. Accordingly the historian qualifies the first verse by the immediate context. The heavens and earth, then ‘created,’ are described as *in chaos*. The earth, afterward fashioned with so much symmetry and beauty was immediately subsequent to this prime act, ‘without form and void,’—and the heavens afterward lighted by their resplendent orbs, were yet a dark abyss.

The author excepts to the English rendering of the word תַּנִּינִם , Gen. i. 21, as “decidedly failing to represent the true import of the original.” Several passages are referred to, to show “the inconsistency of our translators” in their version of the term. While it must be confessed that Scriptural usage leaves us in doubt respecting the species of animal denoted by תַּנ : plur. תַּנִּינִם , the author creates needless obscurity by considering this word as a different form of that in the passage before us. The plural noun which here occurs is from the sing. (tannin) wholly distinct from (tan) above mentioned. The confusion has doubtless arisen, first from the fact that both are sometimes rendered ‘*dragon*,’ and chiefly, perhaps, from the circumstance that in two instances Ezek. xxix. 3, and xxxii. 2, we find the irreg. sing. (tannim) written for (tannin) by a familiar change of ת for י and once also, Lam. iv. 3, the plur. form (tannin) irreg. for (tannim.) Alike, however, in both cases, the sense of the passage determines the irregularity: forbidding the former to be mistaken for the plural, or the latter for the singular.

Were תַּנִּינִם but a variation of תַּנ , and תַּנִּינִם of תַּנִּינִם the alteration which the author suggests of “great reptiles” for “great whales,” would surely be convenient to cover the whole.

Though the distinction is not always preserved in our English version, yet a reference to the instances of their respective occurrence will show that the word here found is elsewhere termed a dragon of the *sea*, Is. xxvii. 1. In Ezek. xxix. 3, it is described as “the great dragon that lieth *in the midst of the rivers*.” See also Job vii. 12. While in the single instance where (tan) is rendered as an inhabitant of the sea, (Lam. iv. 3, “a sea-monster”) the rendering is not sustained by the description which immediately fol-

lows, where the animal is represented as "*drawing out its breast and giving suck to its young.*" This version of the word was probably induced by the irregularity of the form in which it there appears, confounding it with sing. (tannin.) The noun (tan) moreover, is generally distinguished from (tannin) by its prevalent application to a *land* animal in our English version, as in Is. xiii. 22, xxxiv. 13, Ps. xlv. 19, and Is. xliii. 20.—"The beast of the field shall honor me, the *dragons* and the owls," Jer ix. 11, x. 22, xlix. 33. It is sometimes denominated the dragon of the wilderness; and is represented as the tenant of *desolate, waste places*, Malachi i. 3, Micah i. 8.

Accordingly Gesenius defines (tan) "*Bestia quaedam deserticola.*" And on the other hand (tannin) "*Bellua marina; piscis ingens.*"

The Arabic preserves a like distinction, rendering (tina-n) *lupus*, and (tinninon) *serpens ingens, draco*—Freytag. The Syriac furnishes a still clearer distinction which translates 𐤓𐤒 by the word (yoruro) which signifies "*a howling beast of the wilderness*"—𐤓𐤒𐤕 on the other hand, by (ten-yono) a dragon, or *serpent of the deep*.

These facts, especially those from the cognate languages, have induced eminent orientalists, as *Pococke*, &c. to understand by 𐤓𐤒 an animal such as *the wolf*, in which case the phrases "*dragons of the wilderness,*" "*den of dragons,*" "*dwelling of dragons,*" in which connections the word generally occurs, will be perfectly intelligible; while the howling wail ascribed to them in Micah i. 8, will be easy of conception. Rabbi Tanchum, an old Jewish critic, designates the animal as the *Jackal*, and modern travellers tell us that at the East, this creature is noted as the dismal tenant of waste places, where, at night, companies of them may be heard responding to each other, with a most hideous yell, aptly denominated *wailing*.

Ch. i. vs. 5, יום אֶחָד Heb. *day one*.

From the use of the cardinal instead of an ordinal adjective here, the author deduces a theory which, though ingenious, can scarcely be substantiated by an appeal to Scriptural usage. A few instances are brought forward, to attach to אחד "*an idea of something peculiar, especially distinguished from others of the same class.*" We are able to find but two passages in which the word may probably have this force, and even in these we consider it by no means established.

Ezek. vii. 5. Thus saith the Lord, an evil, an *only evil*, behold is come." The context would rather attach to it a sense hinted at in our version, making the idea to be, that a calamity is at hand so utterly wasting that no other is needed; such that there shall be room for no more. This is confirmed by the following sentence. "An *end* is come, *the end* is come," as in Gen. vi. 13. Such a force surely obtains in 1 Sam. xxvi. 8. "Now therefore let me smite him, I pray thee, with the spear, even to the earth *at once* (but one stroke,) and *I will not smite the second time.*" But allowing all that is claimed from the passage above cited, and Cant. vi. 9, we cannot admit the same in regard to any of the others referred to. In 1 Kings xix. 4, "But he himself went a day's journey into the wilderness, and came and sat down under *a juniper tree.*" We see no ground to conjecture that it was a "*peculiar*" juniper "distinguished above all others of the class."

So of 1 Kings xx. 13. "And behold there came *a prophet* unto Ahab."

Gen. xxxvii. 20. Come now therefore, and let us slay him, and cast him into *some pit.*

The author infers from this use of אָחֵר that "the evening and morning constituted a *certain*, a *special*, a *peculiar* day, a day *sui generis*;" and understands that "a *series or succession of twenty-four hour days constituted a period of undefined extent.*" "And so of the subsequent days of the creative week."

If a specific reason must be assigned for the use of אָחֵר here, would it not be quite as plausible to find it in the circumstance that no other day had as yet existed in reference to which this primal succession of day and night could be denominated *first*: that it was rather *numbered "one,"* in relation to the similar intervals which should follow? It is not uncommon, however, in enumeration, where the numbers explain themselves, to use cardinals for the first and second, passing to the ordinal in the succeeding; as in *Suetonius* we find consecutively, unus-alter-tertius, where the connection renders the force sufficiently clear.

A use of אָחֵר singular indeed, is met with in Exodus xviii. 4, where, nevertheless, nothing "*peculiar*" can be denoted. "Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took Zipporah, and her two sons; of which the name of *the one* was Gershom—and the name of *THE ONE* was Eliezer."

But as yet no passages have been referred to, where אָחֵר

occurs in a connection similar to that under consideration. Precisely parallel is its use Gen. ii. 11, where the four rivers are enumerated. The name of *the one* הַאֶחָד (not the *first*), is *Pison*; "the second," "third," "fourth," as here, being expressed by ordinals. We turned to the author's notes on this passage, expecting to find something "*peculiar*" respecting *Pison*, based upon this phraseology, but were disappointed nearly as much as to observe such a course adopted in the connection before us.

However strange the reading be considered in either case, it will surely not be pronounced *singular* upon reference to the parallel instances.

Even where this cardinal adjective does not stand connected with a series of ordinals, which, as in this case, serve to determine its true meaning, it is by no means uncommon to meet with it where it must necessarily have the force of the ordinal; and that without augmentation. Haggai i. 1, "In the sixth month, in *the one* day of the month."

Gen. viii. 5, "In the tenth month, on *the one* day of the month." So vs. 13, "And it came to pass in the one and six hundredth year, in the first month, *the one* day of the month." Here the ordinal in one case, and the cardinal in the other, must have precisely the same force—and moreover the data are furnished in the context, to show, by actual computation, that אֶחָד must mean simply and only "*the first*."

So Ezra x. 16, 17, 'in the day one'—'by the day one'—surely יוֹם, *here* cannot on account of אֶחָד denote "an INDEFINITE PERIOD."

Nehemiah viii. 2, "And Ezra, the priest, brought the law upon *day one*, and read therein from the light until mid-day."

Analogous is the use of a cardinal for "the first" in Greek, Acts xx. 7, Ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων.

Nor is this peculiarity confined in Hebrew to אֶחָד. In 2 Kings xii. 1, we find, 'In the year *seven*' (for *seventh*.) Esther i. 3, 'In the year *three*' (for *third*.)

After the author has satisfied himself that אֶחָד *may* have this *peculiar* signification, he proceeds as a second step in the argument to assume, that יוֹם *may, in this connection*, designate "a period of indeterminate length." That it *sometimes* has this wide sense he has shown by ample reference. The difficulties in the way of adopting it *here*, he has not removed. We suggest a few of them briefly. I. That we are furnished with no intimation of any change in the mean-

ing of this word as we pass to chapters iv. v. vi. and vii.; and yet no one will suppose that when God said to Noah, "*Yet seven days*, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth, it was understood in this acceptation. But why confine this indefinite length of the day to those occupied by the work of creation? We are told that the use of *אָחַר* warrants it; and that the latter clause of verse 5, we must paraphrase thus: "A *succession* of evenings and mornings constituted a *peculiar kind* of day; a day, a period of undefined extent." But we have not the same pretence for a like conclusion respecting the *remaining* days. In all the following cases, the ordinal, not the cardinal adjective is used. And yet the author claims the same construction for the rest, and arbitrarily extends it no further.

II. If the six days of creation were, indeed, periods of unknown and indeterminate length, we are forced to conclude that the *seventh* was so likewise, and that when "he blessed the seventh day," God blessed an *epoch* of untold limit, not a *day*, as we have apprehended. This must entirely alter the aspect of the Fourth Commandment. The ground upon which God instituted the Sabbath was his own holy example, which he deigned to assign as a reason for the command that we set apart one day in seven to himself. This then must be the tenor of the statute: "Six epochs shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work—for in six *epochs* (or, indefinite periods of time), the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh *epoch*, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbatical epoch and hallowed it." Even *figures* can fix no definite idea to such a command.

III. A third objection, and connected with the former, is, that the great principle of devoting to the Lord a *seventh portion* of our time cannot be urged with the author's interpretation. Inasmuch as these periods must have been wholly unequal, marked only by the *irregular* as well as far-between events in the process of creation, the seventh would bear to the former no assigned proportion, and be related to them only in the order of *sequence*. The same feature in the Mosaic institutions, met with in the Sabbatical year, with its peculiar ordinances, must lose its greatest interest, thus divested of its most important relation to the intervals of the original week. It seems preferable, therefore, that those who consider more than six ordinary days to have been necessary for the Deity

to complete the work of creation, should assign some definite and uniform length to these "*peculiar*" days, that when the second, third, fourth, &c., are spoken of, we may understand at least the successive lapses of some *fixed period*, and still regard the seventh as *a seventh portion* of the whole.

To affirm that the day blessed and hallowed was a day of ordinary length, while all the preceding were extraordinary, is to mar one of the most beautiful features of the ritual economy. But we can conceive no possible ground for such an assertion. When, in the inspired narrative, a period is designated as the sixth day, and one directly following as the seventh day, without at all notifying the reader of any *peculiar* meaning in either case, who could believe that an interval of twenty-four hours was intended by one, and an indefinite number of weeks, months, or years, by the other?

Again—When the Deity could as easily have perfected the work of creation at a bidding, as he could fashion a full grown man, or "build a woman on a rib," the most plausible reason for his occupying any space of time in the transactions, would seem to be, that such a course might subserve some important design for the *future*; and how admirable the symmetry of these arrangements, when we view the procedure as intended to lay the foundation for a most important institution to be observed through all generations. If this were indeed the grand motive for such a distribution of the work, how much more natural, simple, and congruous, the division generally understood, than that which this theory proposes.

But the author seems to claim from usage more than will answer his design. He asks for אָחַד as here used, the sense of "peculiar, especially distinguished, from others of the same class," and understands יוֹם here to mean "a day of indefinite length." Combining the words as in the original, we have 'יוֹם אָחַד,' signifying, according to Prof. Bush, "*a peculiar day of indefinite length.*" This would prove the first day to have been peculiar, and especially distinguished from the following days of the creative week, if it would prove any thing.

The prohibition of blood as an article of diet, the author clearly deduces from Gen. ix. 4; but in touching upon the design of such an ordinance, he presents not, as we think, the main idea with sufficient prominence. The peculiar sacredness which attached to blood in religious worship

finds its grand reason in the fact that it was *the specific emblem of expiation*. The article of death, evidenced by the flowing life-blood, was the indispensable requisite for remission. The special, solemn regard with which the blood, even of beasts, was to be treated, eminently tended to impress the mind with its sacred importance in the economy of grace; and the scrupulous abstinence with which they were to refrain from it as an item of food, would naturally add to the reverence with which the Israelites looked forward to the precious blood of the *great sacrifice*. The passage in Levit. xvii. 11, furnishes an explanation. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul."

Here, as we conceive, it is not merely stated that "life goes for life," but that *blood is specifically emblematic of expiation*, pointing with sacred, reverential import, to the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," whose blood cleanseth from all sin; through which he should "make peace," and men have redemption—Coloss i. 20; Ephes. i. 7. Thus would the ritual worshippers be forcibly reminded not to ascribe *vital efficacy* to their bleeding victims, but to look forward to the Heavenly Lamb, whose blood alone was savingly efficacious. This language would convey the idea that in some way, the blood was to be regarded as *vital*; and yet, forbidden as they were, to appropriate this part of their animal oblations, they would be pointed elsewhere to that which should give life; and could not fail to recognise the striking propriety of the whole upon reference to the sacred, life-giving blood of the atoning sacrifice; which should be spiritually administered to his people by the New Testament, and of which they should drink to the life and salvation of their souls. John vi. 53—56.

We cannot think the author happy in the turn which he gives to the sentiment of the next verse. (5.) "And surely, your blood of your lives will I require—at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man—at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man." The whole rests upon his version of the first clause, according to which the remainder is modified, "And surely your blood *for* your lives;" i. e. "in return for the life-blood which you have shed." This is plainly forced, and the violence which it does to the drift of the paragraph, as well as to the original phraseology, must decide against it.

Man was to be secured against the attacks of rapacious animals by that fear of him with which they should be impressed, (verse 2). This instinctive awe of the human form should be a safeguard to Noah's diminished company against the wild ferocity of the brute creation. Moreover, he should be at liberty to slay them at his will for his nourishment and support, (verse 3), with this only restriction, (verse 4), "*But flesh, with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.*" "And (verse 5) surely if the blood of the brute creation is thus to be held sacred, *your* blood of *your* lives," or your life-blood, will I require, i. e. *avenge*. Thus was Noah's band to be protected also against the jealousy and rage of their fellow men, no less than from the wild fury of the lower animals. God declares that *their* blood should be avenged upon the murderer: upon every beast that should destroy human life: upon every man that should brutally assassinate his fellow; and in verse 6 it is specifically ordained that man himself should be the instrument by which Divine justice should visit the sacrilegious deed upon the perpetrator. This we consider as the only natural and true connection; and this view of the passage is demanded by the phraseology.

The verb שׁוּר, though frequently used in an absolute sense, has an established meaning when found in construction with דָּם. To "seek blood," according to the manifest usage of the Hebrew Scriptures, is not to seek it like a beast of prey, or a blood-thirsty assassin. It is by no means equivalent to the English phrase to "seek one's life;" i. e. to aim at his death. But inasmuch as the murderer who *takes* another's life is regarded as having it in his possession, as the spoil of robbery, the Hebrew phrase to "seek blood" means to *search for it*, as thus *plundered*; and when the life of the murderer is taken in return that of the murdered is recovered. This is an established idiom of the language, and to the sense of a passage its observance is very material. To take each word independently and use it in its absolute signification is wholly unwarrantable where the expression is known to be idiomatic. In this case the meaning is completely metamorphosed. How would it answer thus to disregard the idioms of any other language? In the Latin, for example, we have "*dare pœnam*," which all are familiar with, as meaning "to suffer punishment." But "*dare*" absolutely signifies "*to give*." Who would on this ground assert that the expression may mean, "*to ad-*

minister punishment?" We can conceive of cases, to be sure, in which it would be quite *convenient* for one immediately concerned to turn the tables thus, by urging a literal interpretation, but the technicalities of Roman law could not thus be nullified. If liberties of this kind may be taken in one case, where no necessity requires, we see not why the same may not be adopted elsewhere on the most trivial grounds.

But additional violence is done to the passage before us, by taking דָּרַשׁ in a sense almost, if not quite, unparalleled. We recollect of but a single case where it *can* be understood of *instrumental agency*, viz. Mal. i. 9; and this is in an obscure connection, where the bearing of מִיָּד is not agreed upon; and where also it occurs in construction with הִיהָ. The authorized and uniform expression for "by means of" which the author claims from מִיָּד, is בְּיָד as in Mal. i. 1. "The burden of the Lord *by* (b'yadh, by the hand of) Malachi." Exod. iv. 13, "Send, I pray thee, by the hand of (b'yadh,) him whom thou wilt send." So Jer. xxxvii. 2.

But there can be no doubt respecting the force of (דָּרַשׁ) when construed with the verb (דָּרַשׁ), and that especially in connection with (דָּרַשׁ). Though the phrase is idiomatic, no English reader familiar with the Scriptures, fails properly to apprehend it; and it is only with an effort that in the minds of the learned, the legitimate meaning becomes superseded. In Ezekiel, chapter xxiii. all understand the import of the phrase, "his blood will I require at the watchman's hand." So verse 8, "If thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but *his blood will I require at thine hand.*" In Scripture usage, "Sanguinem repetere ab aliquo," is equivalent to "cædem ulcisci." The blood sought, is blood already spilt. It matters greatly whether we are to consider the person from whom 'ab aliquo,' (מִיָּד אִשֵּׁר), it is to be recovered as one who is to obtain it, as an agent, from the murderer, or as himself the individual upon whose person it is to be found. And that the same language should convey both ideas is, in the nature of things, impossible. Just so in the Latin expression, analagous for our purpose, "*petere pœnas ab aliquo,*" the person from whom punishment is sought is the culprit the individual who is *himself to suffer*, and not by any means, he who is to *administer justice* upon the offender. To interpret these words literally, we must understand that instead of *to punish another*, they

mean "*to seek the execution of judgment upon one's own head.*" Ideas radically opposite we should think; and that they may be interchanged at pleasure, or that by the same phrase both may be conveyed in any one connection, will not, we presume, be contended.

But there need be no difficulty in accurately rendering the first clause of vs. 5. The English version reads, "and surely your blood of your lives will I require." Our author's paraphrase is, "I will require your blood in return for the life-blood which you have shed," understanding דרש דם, "to require one's blood" as *to slay one*, in face of its established signification "*to avenge one's blood as already slain.*"

This latter sense we consider the genuine and only proper one of which the phrase is capable.

The Notes before us adduce references which determine this material difference against themselves. Gen. xlii. 22. "Therefore behold also his blood is required." Joseph's brethren by this language, surely did not mean that the life of their brother was to be taken. They supposed alas! that he had already fallen a sacrifice, and stood in fearful expectancy of an *inquisition* for *his blood*. Ps. ix. 12. A strict adherence to the "forms of words" is our best security for arriving at "substance of doctrine."

The blood even of beasts must be held sacred, (vs. 4.) And surely (vs. 5,) *your* life-blood I will *avenge*. Taking the author's meaning of דרש, the sentiment runs thus, "To the blood even of beasts there must be attached peculiar sacredness. And, surely, *your* blood will I *shed*; an incongruity which he seeks to relieve by turning the essential idea upon the force of ל and assigning to it a very unusual bearing. But allowing for this all that the author claims, we have, "Your blood will I *shed* in return for your lives (i. e. the lives of your brethren); I will *shed* it, by means of every beast—by means of man—by means of every man's brother will I seek the life of man. In this last clause, we see not how he avoids the idiomatic force of (darash), except he would have us consider it as covertly involving the *curse of Ishmael's posterity*. This indeed, would seem quite as legitimate as "a tacit reference to *Goëllism*."

Again.—There appears no evidence in the actual state of things either then, or since, of a divine 'provisional expedient,' by which every beast was charged with the destruction of a murderer. The quotation from Job, simply embodies in

poetic language, the idea that to the children of God there should be perfect security from the various forms of evil. It is written also in the same connection, "At *destruction* and *famine* thou shalt laugh;" yet this affords no ground for supposing that by means of *famine*, also, the murderer's life was taken. We consider the language as conveying nothing more than that of the Psalmist xci. 3, 5, 6, "Surely he shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence." "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night nor for the arrow that flieth by day," &c. summed up in vs. 10. "There shall *no evil* befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling."

Our view of the passage receives confirmation from the fact that by the Mosaic law the blood of a man was enjoined to be 'required at the hand of' or *avenged upon*, the beast that should murderously violate the sanctity of human life. Exodus xxi. 28.

Again.—According to the proposed interpretation, vs. 5 is merely tautological of vs. 4, and however it may be referred to "a different state of society," no intimation of the kind is furnished by the context, vs. 4, "*By means of every man will I seek your blood—by means of every man's brother will I seek the life of man,*" vs. 5, "Whosoever sheddeth man's blood *by man* shall his blood be shed."

The author's view of the following clause would also seem to conflict with his version of this passage. The reason assigned for ordaining man as the instrument by whom God would avenge wilful assassination is, as he conceives, "that man bears a visible impress of the divine image in the legal sovereignty with which he is invested." But how then could there be committed to the brute creation the same charge involving such representative capacity? Is it a reason applicable only "at a more advanced stage of society?" But surely, if it was necessary to commit the execution of justice in any degree to the agency of beasts when the whole race of man belonged to a single circle, and when an escape from the avenging stroke of his fellow were scarcely possible, would it not *much more* have been required in later times when the assassin could escape detection—could lose himself amid a crowded population, and effectually elude the most vigilant and persevering search of his fellow-men? In *present* circumstances we could well accommodate the author's theory, and plainly recognise a propriety in *reversing* the arrangement he proposes, making man alone the

executioner in Noah's day, while in ours, man and beast alike should be commissioned to execute the divine vengeance; and he that should escape unwhipt of justice through the crowded avenues of a city, should be torn in pieces on the highway by the ravening beast.

The general view taken of this section in his opening remarks, p. 149, 150, will further substantiate the propriety of the reading for which we contend.

Hence it appears that the language of vs. 5 was rather to assure the confidence of Noah and his company, than to utter a denunciation which should avail as a restraint upon their own passions. Not so much by an intimidating threat, to prevent them from the perpetration of such a foul offence, as to quiet their fearful apprehensions from the violence of man and beast.

The transition from the blood of lower animals to that of man, authorizing the former to be shed with impunity, while the life-blood of the latter should be summarily avenged alike on the rational and the irrational offender, presents a glaring contrast for which the mind involuntarily asks a reason—a reason, indeed, familiar to us, but one which it were by no means inappropriate to suggest to Noah and his associates. Alike with them, representatives as they were of our race, God had preserved a specimen of creation in its inferior orders, providing by his wise direction alike for all, and protecting them alike from the desolations of the flood. But now, the beasts are again to subserve the interest and comfort of the 'lord of creation:' not merely for sacrifice, but to be slain, whenever the cravings of appetite demanded. But the life of *man* was to be preserved with sacred jealousy, and its violation followed with fearful retribution, *because he was created in the image of God.*

Thus would the human race be notified of the surpassing value attached by their Creator to that impress of himself with which he had stamped the noblest of his works. If thus jealous of his *natural* image, how much more of those *spiritual features* which the first pair, alas! already had lost, and which it is the glory of redemption to restore.

So that while we clearly recognise, in verse 6, a Divine warrant for the civil magistrate to take the life of a wilful murderer, we prefer to consider the last clause as pointing to the ground of such a constitution in the fact that man was invested with God's image, and that, even the dim traces of it yet discernible, saving in morals, are not without their

value—cannot be thus daringly effaced; and that he who is guilty of the capital sacrilege, shall pay the forfeiture to society and to God, *with his own blood*.

Chapter xv. 6, “And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.” Upon these words Professor Bush comments thus: “This particular act of faith was counted to him (Abraham), as in its own nature it truly was, as a righteous, *that is, an acceptable, an excellent, a praise-worthy act.*”

This view we consider entirely to fail of the essential import. Though it is not opposed by the grammatical construction, and not unparalleled in usage of terms, it is quite inconsistent with the interpretation furnished by the Apostle Paul. The whole argument in his Epistle to the Romans, where (iv. 3) he avails himself of the inspired testimony concerning the father of the faithful, presents the passage in another light. Every allusion which he makes to it throughout the chapter shows plainly that a more important meaning was attached to the language; and to understand his quotation as our author would have us paraphrase it, would not only not subserve the argument of Paul, but tend directly to impair its acknowledged force.

The Apostle was presenting the doctrine of *gratuitous justification*, as the only hope of the sinner. The law once broken only condemns. Being “weak through the flesh,” it never can effect the salvation of a soul, and they alone who are “*justified by faith*” can live. And to substantiate from inspired truth this fundamental position, he adduces the case of Abraham. “For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.” Even *he*, therefore, had not whereof to glory, in works, before God. He simply believed the Divine promise with a saving faith, and it was imputed to him (set to his account) in order to his justification. But we are told, that “the example of Abraham is adduced, *by way of illustration*, as an *analogous*, not an *identical* act of strong and acceptable faith.” As one which, by reason of some minor resemblance, might be accommodated to his purpose. But the passage is cited as *proof*, to fortify an argument, and therefore must have its direct and obvious import. To show that the sinner’s justification before God could be only by means of faith, and not on the ground of works, he declares that thus was justified the *father* of believers, and proves the

assertion by the very Scripture before us. If the version advocated by our author, convey indeed the legitimate and full sense of the passage, how does it subserve the design of the Apostle? Would Paul have quoted it in that connection, and especially would he have assigned to Abraham's example so great a prominence, were not the exercise of faith here recorded of him, properly and truly justifying in its nature? It would have gained him not the least for his reasoning. The mere testimony that this act of faith was judged *commendable*, approved by God, and recorded to the patriarch's honour *as such*, would by no means have established the position that Abraham was gratuitously justified. It would have made directly for the opposite conclusion. It would have conveyed the idea (remotest from the true design), that in faith so strong—overcoming so many obstacles—believing against all natural grounds of belief, there was involved *something meritorious*; and further, that such an act, *in itself considered*, might *now*, in the case of the sinner, secure the acceptance of God. Pointing out, as the Apostle confessedly is, the *method of justification*, the inference from a quotation so understood, would surely be, that the sinner might have something whereof to glory. And accordingly, in his subsequent appeal to David, we should expect to be referred to his testimony concerning Phineas (Ps. cvi. 31), as perfectly accordant. But what do we find? "*Even as David also describeth*"—showing the harmony of his evidences—"Blessed is the man," *whose act of faith is credited as highly commendable?* No; but "to whom the Lord will not impute sin." The zealous act of Phineas was "rewardable," and when we are told that it was "counted to him for righteousness," we may doubtless understand that it was approved by God according to its nature, and "recorded to the credit of the performer to all generations." But how utterly incongruous would have been the presentation of *this* case in furtherance of the Apostle's reasoning, none can fail to perceive. And if the Scripture quoted concerning Abraham is to be understood as our author would have it, Paul will, for the first time, be chargeable with a blunder in logic. But the same Divine Spirit, who dictated the sentiment before us, guided also the Apostle in his construction of the phraseology, and in his natural, legitimate application of it to his important end. And indeed, as though to leave no room for misconception, suggests the *design* of the record, (verses 23, 24,) expressly stating that it was written, to furnish all who

should follow, with a signal specimen of *justifying faith* as the means of acceptance with God.

If, as we are told, the Apostle adduces the case of Abraham merely to show that *saving faith* must be exercised under *similar discouragements*, the reasoning, in our view, loses very much of its force. True it is, that obstacles equally formidable oppose the appropriating act of the sinner from every other consideration, than the mercy and faithfulness of God—that “what He hath promised he is able also to perform.” In this particular, therefore, Abraham is an illustrious example. But the special appositeness of his case lies in the fact that his faith had reference to a promised Redeemer, and credited the testimony which God gave of his Son. When summoned to leave his country and set his face toward Canaan, Jehovah had declared that he should be a blessing, and that in him “all families of the earth should be blessed.” The great, the stupendous results were thus obscurely presented, but *how these things could be*, was the formidable difficulty. He casts his care upon the Lord—avows his apprehensions, and thus elicits a promise which “*shuts him up to the faith*.” “As the stars of heaven for number, so shall *thy seed* be.” This covers the whole ground—brings before his believing vision and his fond hope his own numerous progeny, pre-eminent among whom was “*the seed*,” “as of one which is Christ:” Gala. iii.

Our Saviour attributes this view of the promise to the patriarch, when he says, John viii. 56, “Abraham rejoiced to see my day—he saw it and was glad.” It is thus that the Apostle establishes the important position that the method of salvation in all ages has been, and must be essentially unchanged. That justifying faith recognises the same promised Redeemer, and derives its saving character from the fact that alike in prospect and in retrospect it fixes upon the same Deliverer. That the *object*, too, of Abraham’s faith, was truly the same with that of ours, is shown from verses 17, 24. He believed in the Almighty as promising to raise him up “a seed, in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed.” We are to believe in this *same God*, considered as having raised up this long-promised seed and deliverer, and as having “declared him to be the Son of God, with power by the resurrection from the dead.”

That צִדְקָה, and δικαιοσύνη, translated “righteousness,” may, legitimately, be understood in the sense of “justification,” will not be questioned, and we see not therefore any

solid ground for rejecting the Apostolical construction so plainly apparent. The *necessity* of adopting it, indeed, seems obvious, on reference to verses 22—24; where, if we incorporate the author's version, we shall read, 22. "And therefore it was counted (imputed) to him for a *commendable act*. 23. Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him; 24. But for us also to whom it shall be imputed *as a commendable act*, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead."

The great objection opposed in the Notes before us, to the more obvious rendering of the passage, is drawn from Hebrews xi. 8, 9, where faith is attributed to the patriarch at a time previous to this promise. Whence it is concluded that he must have been already in a justified state, and therefore that *this particular act* could in no sense have been *in order to his justification*. This, however, is, in our view, a non sequitur at least. It is no where affirmed that each instance of faith alluded to in Heb. xi. is to be considered as saving in its nature, and justifying in its immediate results. The faith (verse 3) "by which we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God," may exist without the slightest reference to a Saviour.

Fuller, on this passage remarks—"Much has been said as to the meaning of both Paul and Moses. The truth appears to be this: it is faith or believing that is counted for righteousness; not, however, as a righteous act, nor on account of any inherent virtue contained in it, but in respect of Christ, on whose righteousness it terminates. Whatever other properties the magnet may possess, it is as pointing invariably to the North that it guides the mariner. So whatever other properties faith may possess, it is as pointing to Christ and bringing us into union with him that it justifies."

Whatever may have been the nature of any prior acts of faith, on the part of Abraham, this is *that particular act* which laid hold on Christ, according as he was divinely promised, and being imputed, or set to his account, secured his justification.

That the Notes, on the other hand, may explain themselves, we find at the close of the comments on verse 7, the author's abstract of Paul's argument so far as the patriarch's case is concerned. He says, "As Abraham, in the face of great discouragements and impediments, firmly believed God, and thereby is said to have had righteousness accounted to him, much more the believing sinner, who, in spite of all the

obstacles in the way, gives credence to the Gospel promise"—(supplying from the context)—has *his* faith accounted to him, "as in its own nature it truly is, as a righteous, i. e. an acceptable, an excellent, a praise-worthy act!"

Accordingly the author couples the case of Abraham with that of Phineas, (so did not Paul), making the faith of the one and the zeal of the other, alike accounted "as heroic, praise-worthy actions." "The conduct of each was so remarkable, so noble, so commendable, in the sight of God, under the circumstances which gave rise to it, as to gain the particular, the marked approbation of Heaven, and to cause it to be distinguished by a corresponding emphasis of honourable testimony. This, we conceive is what is meant by its being 'counted' *in both cases* 'for righteousness,' " p. 244. And yet this testimony of Moses, concerning Abraham, is expressly declared to have been written for our instruction, (vs. 24), as exhibiting the plan of justification in the economy of grace. If it be *thus*, that faith is set to our account, then surely we have whereof to glory. But it is not so before God, "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."*

It cannot be concealed that Prof. Bush's respect for Geology has followed him from the antemundane period, to the time when a confusion drearier far than that of chaos fell upon the cities of the plain. All this might be considered trivial, were there not developed a corresponding inclination to underrate the miraculous character of those dispensations which stand forth in such fearful prominence on the pages of inspired history. We own that miracles are not to be affirmed where neither the record nor the case demands it, but we maintain also, that they are not to be denied, where the explicit statement of the one, or the necessity of the other makes it necessary.

In noticing at length the fiery perdition of Sodom, Gomorrah, &c. he goes with De la Martine, Madden and Volney, to the ground to learn that there are *now* certainly characteristics of the soil, volcanic features of the country which probably furnished *their own fire*, when the Mosaic account explicitly asserts that the *Lord rained* upon the impious land, brimstone and fire. And as if to shut out such unwor-

* See, on this passage, Jo. Fr. Buddeus. *Hist. Eccles. Vet. Test.* Period I. Sect. III. p. 382.

thy conjectures, it is repeated that it was rained "from the Lord," and "*out of heaven.*" Could language speak more distinctly? Hebrew idioms are often made use of for convenience, and passed over as often where they demand attention, but is the last specification of the three an idiom, or are the others without their emphasis? And shall we *thrice* be told that the fiery flood was poured from the *skies*, and yet conclude upon examination, that it came out of the *earth*? The language of the original strikingly associates this catastrophe with that of the deluge of waters. Here the Lord is said to have "rained," (Heb. caused to rain). There, Gen. vii. 4, he says "for yet seven days and I am causing it to rain, &c." The verb too is construed alike in both instances with the same preposition, denoting action *from above*. Every individual word of the remarkably expressive phraseology leads us to the same conclusion, and compels us to believe, in justice to the record, that just as truly as the waters poured from heaven at the deluge, the liquid fires streamed from the skies at God's authoritative bidding. This we gather from the inspired narrative. *This* must be the appeal of paramount consideration and it is only now that we are prepared to examine the territory. In such a course of procedure what estimate should we probably form of the bituminous and sulphureous properties of the soil and the hidden reservoirs of fire that even yet are smoking, fit emblem of that smoke which "ascendeth for ever and ever!" Shall we think of inverting the statement and finding a cause in the effect? Let this be the resort of those who know no better, higher cause: who like Volney labour to prove unintelligent nature one and the same with Nature's Governor and God. With all our respect for Prof. Bush, we confess ourselves astonished here. That he should discover a manifest effort to refer the grand event to second causes, when geological and historical facts so plainly corroborate the simple Mosaic account. Balancing, solicitously between a theory which reduces the whole to a shaft of lightning, firing the combustible magazines "as the flash from steel and flint ignites gun-powder," and one which explains it of a volcanic eruption burying the devoted cities. In fine, preferring the latter though less consonant with the inspired description, than the former. We hesitate not however to pronounce either of them unworthy of the occasion—signally unworthy of the Almighty's end; and falling very far short of the impression which the whole narrative conveys.

Though the sober belief of the author led him to denominate the work miraculous, how vastly does he derogate from its character as such by the adoption of a lame theory, to account for that which God himself has accounted for in a more congruous and satisfactory way? Prefacing the discussion with a remark which prepares us fully for the sequel. "It does not *perhaps* detract from the supernatural character of the visitation to suppose that the Almighty saw fit to employ natural agencies in bringing it about." p. 315. As though the possible interference of such an hypothesis with the scriptural representation were not enough—as though it were the part of a Christian commentator to make choice of human theories, and determine only which of them is best.

Of either theory we say, that it is far beneath the great design which Jehovah had in view. The judgment was to be so manifestly preter-natural that all should acknowledge it of God. Yet if the neighbouring Edomite or Horite, as he gazed upon the conflagration, recollected only the combustible properties of the soil, why need he think of a vindictive Judge, or why refer the catastrophe to the impious character of the inhabitants, when a single dart of the electric fluid, straying from a thunder cloud, could fully, to his mind, account for the event. Or how should the modern traveller judge otherwise, if he might attribute the calamitous event to volcanic eruptions, belonging to the nature of the territory? Vesuvius and Etna have swept their heated billows over an unsuspecting population, not pre-eminent in crime; and where, apart from revelation, would be the evidence that in special, direct interposition for crying enormities of sin, Jehovah appeared over Sodom and Gomorrah 'in flaming fire taking vengeance?' The Almighty would leave the judgment beyond all question, and doubtless would thus have emptied the vials of his burning wrath upon the guilty cities however otherwise had been the geological attributes of their soil. This was a method of punishment which carried with it awful evidence of its origin, and therefore it was chosen.

Diodati thus interprets, v. 24. "The Son of God who had appeared unto Abraham and Lot made this rain to fall by some word or token, which rain was caused by God's omnipotency, and showered upon the land *without any natural cause.*" Explained upon the rational hypotheses the event presents us very much the same aspect of divine interposition as does the burning of Moscow, by the Russians. In

either case, second causes appear under the controlling direction of Providence. But who does not make a wide and important difference here? Who, that is familiar with the Scriptural representation, does not recognize the combustible ingredients of the land, as the smoking remnants and mementos of a curse, which seems to have saturated the very earth?

Not long before, "Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan that it was even as the garden of the Lord," (Gen. xiii. 10); and Moses threatening upon other lands the fearful doom of these cities, clearly describes the characteristic properties under consideration as the effects, not the instruments of the Divine wrath, and expresses the convincing clearness with which the lines of judgment should be traced upon the very face of the country. "So that the stranger that shall come from a far land, shall say, when he shall see the plagues of that land, and the sicknesses which the Lord hath laid upon it, *the whole land thereof, brimstone and salt and burning* that it is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth thereon, like the overthrow of Sodom, &c., which the Lord overthrew in his anger and in his wrath—even all nations shall say, *wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this land?* What meaneth the heat of this great anger?" Deut. xxix. 22, 23.

Even if the geological attributes of the soil were originally such as Prof. Bush maintains, would the Almighty probably have accomplished the work by such natural agents, when a prominent object was to show it preter-natural? We can rather conceive, that the existence of such combustible properties already in the soil, would have prompted the adoption of some other method, lest men, so prone to look downward, should find the moving, operating cause, below the skies.

"There is," says the author, "nothing that we can see at variance with the *really* miraculous character of the event—for it was Omnipotence that waked the sleeping subterranean fires at that particular juncture;" adding (what seems to have been the great consideration,) "nothing but what is in strict accordance with the geological phenomena that now distinguish this remarkable region." On this paragraph we beg to offer a few comments. Was this, we ask, a dispensation which, in its immediate occasion and great design, admitted of being barely miraculous, and not palpably so? Was the reference of this sudden, awful judgment to a Divine hand, to

be arrived at by the slow, rare process of faith, after that sound, orthodox belief of a general Providence had done its utmost? Is this an event which God intended to be classed with the "falling of a sparrow?" Was it enough that men, if they would soberly reflect, might conclude that this work of death was the Lord's? And that Christian commentators in succeeding ages, might remind them of a Providential hand, that doubtless "waked the sleeping fires?"

How should we receive such an explanation of the deluge? And yet, doubtless, if strata of air, in its various states through all past time, could be resorted to, as are the layers of earth, by some adepts in the "Geology of the Heavens," the sternness of that terrible dispensation would be speedily and effectually softened down, and be pronounced a miracle, only because in sacred and profane history among all nations, heathen and Christian, rain has been looked upon as the special, peculiar act of the Almighty. The deluge of fire under consideration is *called miraculous*, because it was the hand of Omnipotence which waked the slumbering flames! Does not the same Omnipotence keep the fires of every volcano and rouse at his pleasure their burning contents? And is every eruption a miracle? Rather would we say, if this be the only evidence of a preter-natural interposition, it has no claim to the name or character of such; and the stranger, as he looks upon the smoking desolations, would be apt to say, not "Wherefore hath the Lord done this unto this land, and what meaneth the heat of *this great anger?*" but, "alas! what a disaster!" and drop a tear of sympathy over the doom of Sodom. The philanthropist may mourn that they should have had so unfortunate a location, and in sincere compassion wish that they could but have known the perils of the place, and have been advertised of the fiery sea that boiled beneath them. Even now, we hear of the terrors of the earthquake at Martinique. What Christian does not refer the calamity to a Divine hand? Yet who pronounces it miraculous? Who thinks of it as such? And with all the natural causes, conjured up at the bidding of Geologists from the original vale of Siddim, who can resist the reflection that those craters would some time have burst, even though it had been upon "the plains of Mamre," or though "fifty righteous" had been found there? If the author would admit the miracle, why need he explain it away? Hear Chateaubriand—who, from his extensive acquaintance with volcanic sites, was well prepared to judge—declare on a personal compari-

son of this region, the improbabilities of such a theory; that "the presence of hot-springs, sulphur, and asphaltos, furnishes no certain proof of the anterior existence of a volcano." "With respect to the ingulphed cities," adds this celebrated traveller, "I adhere to the account given in Scripture, without summoning physics to my aid."

We follow the inspired narrative to verse 26, where we are told that "the wife of Lot looked back from behind him, and she became a *pillar of salt*." Upon which our author comments thus: "We may suppose with great probability that the saline and sulphureous matter, which, in consequence of the eruption, was showering down from the atmosphere, gathered around the unfortunate woman, as a nucleus forming a thick incrustation which gradually became hardened, till at last she stood a massive pillar of this mineral matter," &c.

Though this is quite in character with what precedes, we feel the additional surprise that Professor Bush, calling up such a picture before the imagination, could have transferred it to paper. We should as soon think of referring the death of Ananias and Sapphira to apoplexy, or of Nadab and Abihu to the accidental firing of their garments in their official duties, as to find here any plausible account of this visitation. It is, we confess, heartily revolting to our feelings, to follow such a *rational* description as throws in the back ground the terrible presence of an avenging God. We ask no naturalist to tell us what ingredients *could* have formed such a solid compound—from what neighbouring crater they might have come—or how the heated naphtha, nitre or bitumen, might have dashed against the devoted object. When God needs such ready magazines to furnish him with means of vengeance, or when we can believe it any part of his object, to conceal this signal judgment under the cover of natural causes, we will attend to this embalming process. But the sacred text suggests to us physical difficulties in the way of such an hypothesis. We are told (verse 25) that Lot entered into Zoar as the fiery fluid poured upon the plain; and the phraseology of verse 26, shows us that his wife was *close* behind him. This would convey the idea that she had already advanced beyond the range of the showering flames, and could not easily have been involved in the catastrophe of Sodom. And why suppose one miracle merely to avoid another? Some critics, anticipating this difficulty, have inferred that she must have returned to the city, and perished

in the common ruin! And this is but consistent. It seems, indeed, as though men were intent on substituting their own *miraculous theories*, for the simple statements of inspired truth, patching together any device, however incongruous, to evade the obvious force of words, and that too when there appears no shade of inducement whatever. Accordingly, we find the author's conclusion thus stated: "The truth is, the literal mode of interpretation is not demanded by the terms of the text. Salt is a symbol of perpetuity, and 'a pillar of salt' conveys the idea of a lasting monument, a perpetual memorial of the sad consequences of disobedience." The fearful catastrophe, which, even in the Evangelist's day, a single intimation could call up vividly to the mind, is reduced to this cold, shadowy nonentity: "*Remember Lot's wife!*" that she looked back, and became a "*perpetual memorial.*" How, we are left to conjecture. For aught we are informed by such an interpretation, she might have been buried as far from view as ever Moses was. Give us the embalming operation in preference to this exhausting, annihilating process. If the former were legitimate in explanation of this event, then from the same natural causes, many an impious Sodomite must have been incrustated by this streaming lava, and have stood as truly "a pillar of salt" as she. If the latter be the purport of the Mosaic language, then Cain was a "pillar of salt." Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea were so many "pillars of salt;" either of them far more worthy of the designation than the wife of Lot; for inspiration informs us of the direct interposition by which they met their doom, while of her, we are obscurely told that she became a "perpetual memorial" of the sad consequences of disobedience.

We contend for principles, important as they are true, in the interpretation of miracles. When we are plainly told that our Saviour at Cana of Galilee, "turned water into wine," we ask not to be shown how, by the admixture of certain ingredients, this could be *tolerably* done—We understand the statement as it is. And so in the miraculous events under consideration. Our God is competent to the work without the avail of physical resources. And why prevaricate when the letter of the record is so explicit? German critics do it, but first adopt as a principle of their hermeneutics, the revolting position, that *a miracle is an impossibility*. Professor Bush would never lend them intentional countenance; but in his admiration of their learned ingenuity, he has copied the manner of explaining

away miracles, without recollecting that his own belief in the reality of such interpositions renders all such explanation at once needless and unlawful.

We pass with pleasure from the philological department to the critico-practical features of the work.

And here, we think, Prof. Bush has succeeded to admiration. As a writer of vivacity and warmth he has long been favourably known to the public—but it is in a practical application of Bible truths that we have the full value of his talent, as an eloquent English writer. It is doubtless his favourite occupation. It must be so. He gives no symptoms of constraint except of such as is engendered by the swellings of emotion. The ‘necessity laid upon *him*’ is by the accumulating force of feeling, breaking down all barriers to expression. And accordingly, when he writes, it is with a ‘fountain-pen.’ And when he draws his sketches we *feel* that is with an ‘ever-pointed pencil.’ Very often one is startled as suddenly, and happily little incidents of historical narrative are turned to practical account. Gen. xvi. 7. Gen. xviii. 15.

Not unfrequently the Notes are enriched with an appropriate sentiment from Bishop Hall or Fuller, expressed in their own nervous and direct style. In other instances, the author has adopted their praise-worthy practice of looking upon *all Scripture* as “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, &c.,” and we fancy ourselves sometimes among the old divines of the preceding centuries, as the concealed weapon is drawn upon us, or we receive the powerful thrust when least aware. No inconsiderable portion of the volume is occupied in deducing from the conduct and treatment of our first parents—from the general character, the particular deportment, or the marked deliverances of Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Lot, &c., materials for most profitable reflection: while the calamitous but deserved doom of antediluvian unbelievers—the signal discomfiture of the rebel builders—and the fearful overthrow and fiery perdition of the cities of the plain, are faithfully held up—to warn a scoffing multitude of God’s threatenings, that they betake themselves to the ark; to notify towering, vain ambition, that it shall ‘build a Babel to its own confusion;’ and to advertise the profligate and stubbornly profane, that theirs shall be a “portion in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone.”

We hope to hear from Professor Bush again.

QUARTERLY LIST

OF

NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin, explained and enforced in two Discourses. By H. A. Boardman, Pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: William S. Martien. 1839. pp. 124.

These Sermons having been heard by the people of Mr. Boardman's charge, "with great interest and satisfaction," as is stated in the letters of the elders of the church, a request was made for their publication, that others might have the advantage of perusing them. It is not always wise in ministers to comply with such requests. A sermon may be heard with much interest by a people attached to their pastor, which the public may receive with great indifference. The interest excited by its delivery is often to be ascribed either to the eloquence of the preacher, or to the peculiar circumstances of the congregation. In coming before the public it is despoiled of all the advantage which the preacher's manner may have given it, and it appears before a less partial tribunal. When, however, the subject is not only of intrinsic importance, but of general interest, a pastor may fairly presume that what has proved instructive to his own people, will also prove useful to others. This is certainly the case as it regards the subject of these discourses. The doctrine of original sin is not only one of the most important doctrines of the Bible, but it has been of late years the prominent subject of discussion and controversy in our church. The public attention has been repeatedly called to it; serious errors and grave misrepresentations have been assiduously propagated with respect to it, and the people are anxious to know the truth in relation to this matter. There was a call, therefore, for just such instruction as these sermons furnish; and we have no doubt that the favourable judgment of Mr. Boardman's own congregation respecting them, will be sustained by the verdict of the public. They are excellent sermons. The first discusses the subject of native depravity; the second that of imputation. On both these points the truth is presented with singular clearness, and supported by an array of argument which is presented with judgment and force. Both in the letter addressed to his elders, prefixed to the volume, and in the appendix, Mr. Boardman gives several interesting extracts, illustrating the statements made in the sermons, and proving how serious are the departures from the doctrine of the Scriptures and of the Reformed Churches, which are now publicly avowed even by Presbyterian ministers.

This volume is very handsomely printed, and the edition, we understand, was small. We hope it will soon appear in a form adapted for a wider circulation.

Letters to School-Children. By E. C. Wines, author of "Hints on Popular Education," "How shall I govern my School," &c. &c. Boston: 1839. pp. 135. 18mo.

This little volume is another valuable contribution from Mr. Wines to the cause of education. It conveys much sound instruction, in a style admirably adapted to its purpose.

Address, delivered before the Alumni Association of the College of New Jersey, September 26, 1838. By James McDowell, Esq., of Rockbridge County, Virginia. Princeton. pp. 51. 8vo.

An eloquent exhibition and enforcement of the duties of educated men. They, whose privilege it was to hear it as it came glowing from the lips of the speaker, will rejoice in the opportunity of renewing over its pages the impression then made. We would especially commend its closing paragraphs to the attention of all fanatical agitators of the question of Slavery.

The Apostolical Commission. The Sermon at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Leonidas Polk, D.D., Missionary Bishop for Arkansas; in Christ Church, Cincinnati, December 9, 1838. By Charles Pettit McIlvaine, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese of Ohio. Gambier. pp. 43. 8vo.

We have, in this Sermon, a condensed and popular statement of the argument for Diocesan Episcopacy. The Right Reverend author has made the most of his case, though he has offered nothing new, and has ventured upon some very questionable assertions. Though he magnifies his office, he does it, without that insulting arrogance which some of his brethren never fail to exhibit, and without casting "reflections upon those parts of Protestant Christendom, with which, on this head, he is sorry to differ."

Elements of Trigonometry, Plain and Spherical, adapted to the present state of Analysis. To which is added, their application to the principles of Navigation and Nautical Astronomy, with Logarithmic, Trigonometrical, and Nautical Tables. For the use of Colleges and Academies. By the Rev. C. W. Hackley, Professor of Mathematics in the University of the City of New York. New York. pp. 307, 8vo.

Every friend to scientific education in our country must rejoice in the publication of a work upon Trigonometry, adapted to the present state of Analysis. Trigonometry has long since passed far beyond its original object, the investigation of the relations of the sides and angles of tri-angles; and its collateral uses in the higher departments of mathematical analysis, and especially in Physical Astronomy, have become more important than its original end. But there are, we believe, colleges in our land which still continue to teach under the name of Trigonometry the few theorems which are immediately applicable to Land Surveying and Navigation, leaving the student in utter ignorance of the true scope and extent of the science. Professor Hackley's work, though less comprehensive than we could have wished to see it, is perhaps sufficiently extended to meet the present wants of most of our institutions. Nor are we altogether satisfied with the arrangement of his treatise. He complains of it as a fault in other treatises, that they contain, at the commencement, a tedious succession of general formulæ, the uses of which are not understood; and he accordingly begins with

the investigation of theorems which are afterwards seen to be only particular cases of more general ones. We object to this arrangement, in the first place, because it is unscientific. The natural starting point for the science of Trigonometry, after the elementary relations have been established between the angulo-linear functions, is in the general theorem for the line and cosine of the sum and difference of any two arcs, from which every other trigonometrical truth may be deduced, without the construction of a diagram. And, in the second place, we believe that the scientific order is also the most simple and intelligible. "Select, said Laplace to the Professors of the Normal School,—select, in instruction general methods,—endeavor to present them in the simplest manner, and you will find that they are, generally, the easiest." Notwithstanding these abatements, we look upon the work of Prof. Hackley as better adapted to the purposes of instruction than any text-book, of native growth, upon the same subject, and could wish therefore to see it coming into general use.

The Rank and Dignity of Man, an Address delivered to the Students of Florence Academy, Washington County, Penn. By Alexander Campbell. Bethany, Va. pp. 23. 8vo.

A remarkable production from the pen of the great founder of Campbellism—remarkable in several respects, but chiefly on account of its wandering off into an exposition "of the reigning philosophy of Paris and France" in illustration, to the lads of Florence Academy, of the dignity of human nature. The author cannot have read very extensively upon this subject, or the witticisms of Henry Heine would have preserved him from the pleonasm, "*Paris, and France*;" and, even without travelling beyond his mother tongue, the manifold and often indignant expostulations of Coleridge would have guarded him against attributing "*reason*" to the "feathered tribes of heaven, and the finny and scaly broods that swim in the deep." It is to be wished that our American aspirants after these philosophical mysteries would at least keep back the publication of their wonderful discoveries, until they have acquired something more than the slender ability of interlarding their discourse with such terms as *the me*, and *the not me*, *the infinite*, and *the finite*.

A Funeral Discourse occasioned by the death of the Hon. Stephen Van Rensselaer, delivered in the North Dutch Church, Albany, on Sabbath Evening, Feb. 3, 1839. By Thomas E. Vermilye, D.D., Pastor of the Church. pp. 43. 8vo.

We have, in this excellent discourse, an outline of the leading features in the character of the eminent man whom it commemorates. The portrait is valuable to all, since all may derive enjoyment and profit from the knowledge that such a man has lived. His example furnishes a striking illustration of the power of religious truth over the heart, under circumstances which have always been found to present strong temptations; and shows that the greatest simplicity of manners and character, and the most humble and fervent form of piety may be maintained in the highest stations of wealth and influence.

Address, to the graduates in Jefferson College, delivered on the day of Commencement, Sep. 27, 1838. By M. Brown, President, Washington. pp. 10. 8vo.

CONTENTS OF NO. II.

ART. I.—1. The Chinese : A General Description of the Empire of China and its Inhabitants. By John Francis Davis, Esq. F. R. S. &c.	
2. The Stranger in China ; or, The Fan-qui's visit to the Celestial Empire in 1836—7. By C. Toogood Downing, Esq., Mem. Roy. Coll. Surgeons.	
3. China ; its State and Prospects, with especial reference to the spread of the gospel ; containing allusions to the Antiquity, Extent, Population, Civilization, Literature, and Religion of the Chinese. By W. H. Medhurst, of the London Missionary Society,	147
ART. II.—Claims of the Gospel Ministry to an Adequate Support. An Address of the Presbytery of Elizabethtown to the Churches under its care,	180
ART. III.—The Scripture Guide ; a Familiar Introduction to the Study of the Bible. Prepared for the American Sunday School Union, and revised by the Committee of Publication,	201
ART. IV.—1. Mammon or Covetousness the Sin of the Christian Church. By the Rev. John Harris,	
2. Anti-Mammon : or an Exposure of the Unscriptural Statements of Mammon, with a Statement of True Doctrine as maintained by sound Divines, and derived from Holy Scripture. By two Clergymen,	222
ART. V.—Memoirs of Mrs. Hawkes, late of Islington ; including, Remarks in Conversation and Extracts from Sermons and Letters of the late Rev. Richard Cecil. By Catharine Cecil,	239
ART. VI.—Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Genesis ; Designed as a General Help to Biblical Reading and Instruction. By George Bush, Prof. of Heb. and Orient. Lit. New York City University,	271
Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets,	302



NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

THE publisher of the *Biblical Repertory*, under the impression that existing circumstances call for some mutual explanations and corrections, begs leave to make the following statements to the patrons of the work.

As to the *complaints which have occasionally been made by the subscribers.*

I. *Want of punctuality in bringing out the numbers of the Repertory.* The publisher has in this matter done what he could. In a work so entirely original, and appearing in such large divisions, some irregularity is to be expected. Every effort shall be made in future to remove this evil.

II. *The failure of subscribers to receive their copies of the work.* This is an evil over which the publisher has no control. It belongs to the mail department. The most scrupulous care is always taken properly to put up, and faithfully to mail the numbers as they appear. This being the case, the publisher cannot be held responsible for their safe arrival. He may and does deeply regret, and would gladly cure the evil, but it lies beyond his power, and the risk on his part ceases when the work leaves his hands.

III. *Irregularity in presenting bills to some who have paid distant agents.* This may occur in various ways. A want of promptness in some who were *formerly* agents, in making their returns. In all such cases the subscribers who had paid would *appear on our books* as in arrears, though in fact not so. Again, it is the publisher's rule to put a bill in the April number of every subscriber, who to appearance has not paid, with the understanding that if in the mean time he has paid an agent, he will consider it as *unknown* to the publisher, and virtually withdrawn. As our subscribers are of a select character, and very widely scattered over an im-

Notice to Subscribers.

mense territory, some errors are to be looked for, especially as our agents in remote parts of the country, report at distant intervals, and may have collected subscriptions of which the publisher has no knowledge. Where the *publisher himself* has made mistakes in collecting, he has felt specially called on to confess it with deep regret, and is ever ready, (he hopes he need hardly say it) promptly to correct them.

If it may be permitted, without seeming to be captious, in turn to complain a little, the publisher would add.

I. There are many irregularities in the manner of requesting *discontinuance, and change of direction*. Notices of the former should be forwarded *one month* before the end of the year, *post paid*, and of the latter, one month before the issuing of the next coming number. And in regard to discontinuance, it is a fixed principle in the issue of all periodicals, that all arrearages must *first* be paid. At least every publisher may be permitted to hold it at his option to refuse, or grant such a demand. A considerate subscriber would scarcely make such a question necessary.

II. The publisher has to bear a most *onerous tax* in the postage of subscribers, writing to him on their own business. This can hardly be understood by one who has not felt it. It is a serious evil, and a real injustice.

III. The arrears of subscribers now exceed \$2,000!! With the frequently recurring and heavy expenses of such a publication, such delinquencies must threaten the extinction of the work if long continued. The publisher would therefore respectfully, yet earnestly solicit the payment of all subscriptions now due. For while the aggregate loss to him is very great, the debt of each subscriber is so trifling that for that reason in part, it may heretofore have been overlooked. He may be pardoned for adding, that being without a capital, that having at first undertaken the work (with much fear,) impelled by a supreme regard to the great principles and interests it so ably maintains, and being now especially in a most painful and even critical state of health, he appeals with affectionate confidence to the patrons of the work who are now in arrears.

CONTENTS OF NO. III.

ART. I. —Concordantiae Librorum Veteris Testamenti Sacrorum Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, &c. &c. Auctore Julio Fürstio, Doct. Phil. Lipsiae,	305
ART. II. —The Life of John Calvin, the Great Reformer. By Paul Henry, D.D.,	339
ART. III. —A Brief History and Vindication of the Doctrines received and established in the Churches of New England, with a specimen of the New Scheme of Religion beginning to prevail. By Thomas Clap, A.M., President of Yale College,	369
ART. IV. —Sermons by the late Rev. Edward D. Griffin, D.D. To which is prefaced a Memoir of his life. By William B. Sprague, D.D. Minister of the second Presbyterian Congregation in Albany,	404
ART. V. —General Assembly of 1839,	416
Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets,	449

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY 1839.

No. III.

ART. I.—*Concordantiae Librorum Veteris Testamenti Sacrorum Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, &c. &c.* Auctore Julio Fürstio, Doct. Phil. Lipsiae. 1837-8. Sect. I—VIII.

THE appearance of great literary undertakings, whether deserving of the name from the novelty or importance of their subjects, or from the amount of patient labour or of original thought expended in their execution, may appropriately be compared to that of eminent individuals in the political world. For as these latter exert a powerful influence upon the character and conduct not only of the men among whom they live and move, but also of their posterity to distant times : so important literary achievements, while thousands of ordinary publications are suffered to sink into oblivion, remain as monuments of the intellectual prowess of the age in which they are produced, and serve as guides and helpers to future advances in knowledge, virtue, and happiness. Hence it is highly proper that their appearance and character be recorded in literary history for the benefit of posterity as well as of contemporaries, in like manner as those of celebrated men are preserved in the history of political events. These

two histories unitedly compose that of the entire man, considered both as an acting and as a reflecting being.

The two principles of action and reflection, although inseparably combined in every individual of the human race, have each arrived in various nations and epochs at various degrees of development. The predominance of the former tendency displays itself in the performance of deeds of heroism, while that of the latter is exhibited in aspirations after literary distinction. This truth will be found strikingly exemplified on comparing the history of the middle ages with that of our own times.

The former of these two tendencies may be termed the *objective*, or that in which the united faculties of mind and body seek to manifest themselves in outward action; while to the latter we may give the name of *subjective*, or that in which the mental powers, having attained a high degree of development, are more especially directed to abstract reasoning. Two opposite tendencies analogous to these may likewise be observed in the operations of the mind alone, which either restricts itself almost exclusively to a consideration of the objects presented to it by the world without, or, soon leaving these, proceeds to digest, to combine, and to work out new results of its own, independent of any further external influence. The former tendency is exhibited in the production of learned compilations, the latter in that of speculative and theoretical works.

As all ideas, including even the most abstract, are in the first place excited although not created by perceptions, and those chiefly of external objects, it follows that the objective development of the mind must necessarily be first in the order of time; and that only after the completion of such development can its subjective powers manifest themselves in any pre-eminent degree: or as Schiller beautifully expresses it,

Nur durch das Morgenthor des Schönen
Dringst du in der Erkenntniß Land;
An höhrem Glanz sich zu gewöhnen,
Uebt sich am Reize der Verstand.

If we desire to know the degree in which these opposite tendencies of the mind are developed in any nation or epoch, we have only to ascertain the character of its principal literary productions; and on this account if no other, their appearance must attract the attention of those who desire to become acquainted with the history of the progress of the human

mind. The work whose title is placed at the head of this article is one which we regard as presenting strong claims to consideration, on account of the extraordinary amount of mental labour both subjective and objective which its execution manifests as well as its important bearings on the advancement of biblical studies.

As this work comprises a Hebrew Lexicon as well as a Concordance to the Hebrew Bible, we will consider its claims in each of these respects separately, commencing with the former. The lexicography of Dr. Fürst does not consist in the mere introduction of improvements of greater or less consequence into the systems of his predecessors: but is founded on an original plan of his own, the result of new and most enlarged views of the philosophy of language. These views, by making higher claims on the philologist than have been heretofore preferred, give rise to such bold investigations and happy discoveries, that, although occasionally warned by a too great boldness of conjecture to be cautious in their application, we feel continually more and more inclined to adopt them in all their breadth and fulness.

On examining into the leading features of the new system of Hebrew lexicography as compared with those which have preceded it, and tracing the course pursued by this department of philological science, we obtain a full confirmation of the truth of the axiom above laid down, that the chief tendency of the mind in its first operations is decidedly objective.

Lexicography, or that science which has for its object the elements of language, viz. words separately considered, was first applied to the Hebrew about a thousand years after it had ceased to be a living tongue. Up to that period it had been learned much in the same manner as that in which a child acquires its maternal idiom, namely by obtaining a knowledge of a succession of phrases and entire sentences rather than of detached words. Now this synthetical mode of acquiring a language closely resembles the operations of nature in the formation of speech; for it should be remembered that the words which constitute the body of a language are created not singly and in succession, but simultaneously in the form of propositions. The same method of study is still in use among the Oriental and Polish Jews, who obtain a practical acquaintance with the entire contents of the Old Testament and even of the Talmud, without ever knowing that such a work as a lexicon exists, its place being supplied to them by living

teachers, who, as it were, resuscitate the inanimate form of the language by again clothing it in living articulate sounds.

This mode of learning a dead language can be successfully pursued only when we enjoy the constant aid of a living instructor, who, by first explaining the meaning of the strange sounds through the medium of others which we have been accustomed to employ as the exponents of ideas, and by afterwards accustoming us through a long course of practice to associate our ideas with the new sounds and the signs representing them, may in time succeed in making the dead language bear to us the relation of a living one. Without such assistance the signs in which the spirit of the dead language lies embalmed must forever remain to us a mystery, unless we can learn their signification by means of others with which we are familiar, or, in other words, unless we are furnished with books which, by explaining the etymological history and meaning of every word, in a language already known to us, may in some measure supply the place of *viva voce* instruction.

As regards the Hebrew, when we consider that the reverence in which the sacred records it contains have ever been held by the Jewish nation has caused the language to be preserved by tradition from generation to generation, and provision to be made for a constant succession of teachers spending their lives in the study and explanation of the law and its language, we are less inclined to feel surprized at the fact that the attention of their learned men was not sooner directed to the investigation of single words, even when copies of the Scriptures, glosses and various readings of the text, and copious commentaries written for the elucidation of particular books existed in abundance, and were continually receiving fresh accessions to their number. And in fact, it was only when, in consequence of increased oppressions and dispersions, the band of teachers became diminished, their schools shut up or destroyed, nay the study of the Law itself at times prohibited under penalty of death, that some of the most intelligent men of the nation, perceiving the danger to which the holy language lay exposed of becoming at length irretrievably lost, undertook the compilation of lexicographical works, in order to prevent the occurrence of so deplorable a misfortune.

The earliest attempt in this department of literature of which we have any certain knowledge, is a collection of seventy difficult words made by R. Saadia Haggaoon in the

ninth century, accompanied by brief explanations in Arabic. But the first work deserving the name of a Hebrew lexicon was that composed by R. Menahhem ben S'ruk about the commencement of the eleventh century, and which, although never submitted to the press, was evidently, from the accounts we have of it, far in advance of the philological science of the day; since its author, by considering roots whose second letter is doubled or which contain a weak letter as derived from primitive biliteral themes, anticipated improvements in Hebrew lexicography which have been brought forward and developed by a distinguished scholar of our day, and are made by Dr. Fürst the stepping-stones to new and splendid discoveries. Considered however as a whole, the lexicon of Ben S'ruk was greatly surpassed by that of a Spanish physician named Rabbi Jonah. This author, while he did not neglect the traditional authority, on which, with the aid of the context, the work of his predecessor entirely rests, made an admirable use of the numerous analogies existing between the Hebrew and his mother-tongue, the Arabic. Many of the illustrations contained in his work, as well as those in the similar one of R. Jehuda ben Karish, were afterwards adopted by R. David Kimhhi, whose lexicon, the *Sepher Hashshorashim*, has remained the standard Jewish authority to the present time. It far excels those that preceded it both in fulness and accuracy, as well as in the number of valuable exegetical remarks with which it abounds. The roots, under which the words belonging to them are promiscuously ranged, succeed each other alphabetically, with the exception that the pluriliterals and those of the biblical Chaldee are respectively placed after all the triliterals which commence with the same letter. The grammatical order of the species and modes of verbs is usually though not invariably observed, and each word is in general supported by numerous quotations.*

In the productions of these native lexicographers a prominent objective tendency is manifest throughout. They all show the acquaintance of their authors with the Hebrew to have been exceedingly familiar and minute; so that the imperfections they exhibit are properly to be ascribed to their want of insight into the philosophy of language.

* We are glad to have it in our power to announce that a new edition of this work with improvements by its editors, F. S. Lebrecht and J. R. Biesenthal, is now publishing at Berlin in two quarto volumes, of which the first has already appeared.

The earliest among these writers were firmly of opinion, with the commentators who preceded them, that as the Law of the Lord is perfect, the language in which it is contained must also be perfect, and therefore would stand in no need of aid from foreign sources for its elucidation. In consequence of this belief and of the general objective tendency of their minds, whenever they undertook the illustration of an individual word, they regarded it as it presented itself in the Bible, without referring to any other language than the Hebrew, and without attempting to discover those natural laws of speech which caused it to assume such and such a form rather than another. They supposed their task performed when they had collected the several meanings in which, according to traditional interpretation, the word was employed in the various passages where it appeared; and when, as was not unfrequently the case, these meanings appeared entirely unconnected and even diametrically opposite, their purely objective mode of viewing the subject prevented them from seeking to trace out the primary signification of the root, a knowledge of which alone could remove these apparent discrepancies.

In a few instances indeed, where the customary aid of tradition appears to have been wanting, we find them having recourse to a living sister dialect. Thus it is related in the Talmud (*Rosh Hashshána*, fol. 26) that the rabbis were ignorant of the meaning of the word טאטאר *Is. 14: 23*, until one of them heard his foreign servant say to a woman שקיל טאטאר וטאטא ביתא "take the broom and sweep the house." So also they did not know what ירבך *Ps. 55: 23*. signified, until an Arab was heard to use the expression שקול ירבך ושדי אנכלאי "take thy burden and cast it upon the camel." (*Meg. fol. 18.*)

To the general rule however of closely adhering to tradition, and of endeavouring by means of it and of the context to make the Hebrew elucidate itself, we meet with no considerable exception until the time of R. Jonah, who first laid under contribution for this purpose the rich treasures of the copious and nearly related Arabic; an example which has been followed up with the most signal success by learned European Orientalists of the two last centuries. These scholars observed that words of the same form and bearing precisely the same meaning as the Hebrew, were of constant occurrence in the Arabic; frequently too they found the primary signification of a root still in use in the latter language which no longer appeared in the former, and were enabled

by means of it to exhibit all the secondary acceptations in a beautifully logical connexion. In many instances the root itself of a numerous stock of derivatives was discovered, and thus a number of words united under a single stem which before had been supposed to belong to several. Much information was also gained on the subject of the interchange of letters, the study of which in the Arabic is facilitated by an orthography at once euphonic and etymological.

Still these investigations were not regulated by a comprehensive philosophical view of the laws regulating the creation and development of languages or of the essentially organic nature of the connexion existing between those of the same stock; and hence the rage for directly referring every thing in the Hebrew to the standard of the Arabic was suffered to increase to an extent the injurious effects of which are still but too apparent in our best lexicons. A full consideration of this interesting subject if undertaken here would lead us too far from our main purpose; it must therefore be reserved for a future occasion: but before leaving it we would remark, that we are far from desiring either to depreciate the value of modern labours and discoveries, or to deny the closeness of the connexion existing between the Hebrew and the other branches of the Shemitish stock. What we do mean to say is, that when the investigation of the Hebrew shall have been conducted with a clear conception of the true origin and nature of language, and accompanied by an accurate analysis of articulate sounds and of the laws on which their mutations depend, not only will the true relations which the Hebrew bears to its sister dialects be perceived, but the language will likewise be seen extending its points of affinity far beyond these narrow bounds, and uniting with all other primitive tongues in the indissoluble bond of a community of origin.

Notwithstanding what may seem the boldness of this assertion, and the magnitude of the obstacles which the philologist must encounter who undertakes a practical demonstration of its truth, still we think that its probability at least will become evident to all who attentively consider the numerous examples given by Gesenius of strong resemblance and even identity between Shemitish and Indo-European primitives. If any fail of being fully convinced by these facts, although unable positively to deny the truth of the theory they tend to support, they should reflect that the discovery of them has proceeded rather from a partly unconscious anticipation, the result of long continued and laborious

researches, than from any very profound or original views of the organic nature of language. That such is really the case, and that much more remains to be accomplished in this respect than has hitherto been performed, is incontestably proved by the multitude of striking comparisons contained in the concordance of Dr. Fürst.

In the lexicographical department of this work its author shows a constant endeavour, excited by the distinguished success which has attended the application of the science of comparative philology to the Indo-European languages, to burst asunder the bands that for a thousand years have held the Shemitish tongues in an isolated condition apart from every other. And in truth his deeply penetrating mind and extensive knowledge of the Indo-European as well as Shemitish languages, have enabled him to bring forward a host of cogent proofs in support of his theory of the original intimate relation if not identity of those primitive languages of the ancient world to which he gives the name of Sanscritico-Shemitish, and which comprise the Sanscrit family including the numerous dialects of India, the Medo-Persic, the Shemitish, the Græco-Latin, the Teutonic, and the Slavonic.

Such being the opinion of this eminent philologist, it becomes requisite for our own satisfaction to inquire into the reason of its adoption. This is not to be sought in the mere external form of these languages, since their striking dissimilarity in this respect is that which presents the greatest obstacles to their reunion under one head, and has hitherto caused those belonging to the Shemitish family to be considered as completely *sui generis*. In fact it was something lying far deeper in the philosophy of language than this: it was the perception and acknowledgment of a constant relation between the objective sound of a word and the subjective idea which called it into existence, an idea which must be radically and essentially the same in every human mind. In consequence of this relation between a word and its producing cause, the idea it conveys, and of the fundamentally uniform nature of a given idea by whomsoever entertained, it follows that even the words employed by different classes of men must bear the stamp of a common origin; notwithstanding that discrepancies may appear, owing to the variety of ways in which the same idea may be perceived by different individuals, and still more to the many influences acting upon the sound representing it both in its creation and during its whole existence.

This relation of a word to its originating idea is not to be looked for in all its parts as we now meet with it, or even as it was first produced; since nothing purely ideal can be endowed with a physical existence, without at the same time receiving some alloy:

Dem Herrlichsten was auch der Geist empfangen
Drängt immer fremd und fremder Stoff sich an.*

So that a word even in its purest and most genuine form will usually be found to contain some foreign admixture in addition to the sounds immediately related to the idea it expresses; a fact which Prof. Bopp, in following out and improving upon the views of the Indian grammarians, has developed with singular ingenuity and depth of research in his Sanscrit Grammar, when treating of the formation of words by the addition of Krit and Unâdi suffixes to primitive themes. A full and clear perception of this truth is of the greatest importance to the successful investigation of the etymological history of the Hebrew; since it affords the means both of uniting under single heads the greater part of its synonyms and of ascertaining the relations of its roots to those of other primitive tongues.

Formerly Hebrew roots were considered as indivisible totalities, each constituent part of which had an equal share in conveying the idea. Consequently each root preserved a distinct exclusiveness with regard to the rest, and was supposed to participate in a peculiarity pervading all the Shemitish languages, viz. that of being composed of three consonants. It being however perceived that many verbs of the same or a similar meaning had two radicals in common, while the third was an *imperfect* letter, lexicographers at length came to the conclusion that they must have been constructed from biliteral themes by the addition of a prefixed, affixed, or inserted imperfect letter to complete the usual trilateral form. These views were further extended by observing, on a comparison of the Hebrew roots with their cognates in Aramaic and Arabic, that certain classes of letters were frequently interchanged, especially those of the same or neighbouring organs, the liquids, and the quiescents. But although the roots of the several Shemitish languages were thus brought nearer together, the great majority of Hebrew synonyms continued to be regarded as destitute of any other etymological connexion.

* Göthe's Faust.

This supposition is successfully combated by Dr. Fürst, who has ascertained beyond doubt that the admixture to a primitive biliteral may and often does consist of a *perfect* letter. The investigations to which he was led by this discovery, have not only brought the great mass of Hebrew roots into close comparison with those of numerous other languages, but have also shown an interconnexion both in form and meaning between many of the former which had been regarded as entirely independent of each other. This he accomplishes by a skilful analysis of words and their elements, in order to distinguish between those sounds which are of importance as being strictly related to the ideas they convey, and those which are adscititious and therefore of no moment. Being however well aware that the further the province of a word is extended and the greater the allowances made for the changes to which sounds are liable, the more imminent is the danger of running into vague speculation and conjecture, he, before pronouncing as to the essentiality or non-essentiality of any of the elements of a word, carefully compares it with its cognates in the other Shemitish dialects and with all its derivatives and synonyms. He then concludes that the elements which are common to them all, constitute the real theme, and that the remainder, being mere admixtures, may safely be disregarded in further etymological comparisons.

Having thus ascertained the root, he next traces it through the principal languages of the Indo-European stock, thus giving it a greater historical development, and as it were setting the seal to his former discoveries. By this means he often succeeds in reducing a number of existing roots to a single primitive theme; while those which are no longer to be found in the language, and which lexicographers formerly attempted to supply directly from Aramaic, Arabic, and Ethiopic sources, often in a very far-fetched and unsatisfactory manner, he clearly and naturally deduces from languages which, although less related to the Hebrew, belong indubitably to the same great class of tongues.

This analytical process he employs also in finding out the primary significations of roots, whence all their own acceptations as well as those of their derivatives naturally spring. Here too the danger of being confounded and misled by the numerous particulars which must be considered in order to arrive at correct conclusions, pointed out the necessity of establishing some guiding principle by which to regulate the investigation. Our author chose for this purpose the traditional

history of the significations of each word; having detailed these at length, he adopts them as the data on which to ground subsequent inquiries, and then proceeds to develope, unite, and complete them by means of his researches in comparative philology.

The success attending the constant and faithful application of this analytico-historical method of induction, caused him to lay down, in a previous work,* the following propositions as incontestable: "1. That there is no verbal or pronominal root in Hebrew or Aramaic which is not completely identical in primary form and meaning with those of the other Sanscritico-Shemitish languages; and that consequently the frame-work and plan of all the languages included under this designation must be in effect the same. This is not a mere lifeless unity of language, but an organic one, inspired by an animating principle throughout, with development and progress, growth and death, natural simplicity and unnatural artificiality, like man himself. 2. That the opinion maintained by the rational school of the fossilizing (*Erstarrung*) of the Shemitish roots in a certain number of consonants and syllables is without foundation, seeing that they are identical both in form and meaning with the Sanscrit. That the alleged incapacity for composition in the Shemitish roots is disproved by the historical comparison with those of the Sanscrit, from which it appears that a great part of them are composed of an original theme and a prepositional prefix. 3. That these prepositional prefixes which enter into the composition of the roots, and which are readily discernible by analysis in the initial non-radical syllable, have, as in the other families of tongues, strictly defined and permanent significations, which, as well as those of the themes themselves, are to be ascertained by historical comparison. 4. That this unity extends not only through the roots, but also through the primary and most predominant grammatical formations; in short every affirmative has its history."

That the dazzling results of these bold and in general happy speculations have occasionally led this indefatigable scholar to too great length in slighting the labours of his predecessors, we cannot altogether deny: yet it would be doing his merits signal injustice were we not to acknowledge that the success which for the most part has crowned his exertions, clearly evinces the correctness of his views and also of the plan

* *Perlenschnüre aramäischer Gnomen und Lieder*, Vorrede, pp. 15, 16.

which they have induced him to adopt. Indeed we regard his work as the exposition of a new system in Hebrew lexicography, and one which we cannot doubt will in a short time be carried by the judicious application of the principles he has laid down to a degree of perfection of which no other language in the world can boast. To support these remarks by copious and appropriate examples would be an easy task, as such are furnished by almost every page; but, as we have already reached the limits assigned by us to this part of our subject, we will merely state in addition the outlines of the plan on which the lexicographical portion of the work is conducted, before proceeding to a consideration of its claims as a concordance properly so called.

Immediately under the word to be explained, and preceding the citation of the passages of Scripture containing it, is placed its etymological history and elucidation in rabbinic Hebrew and in Latin. The Hebrew part of the exposition, which is written in a pure and elegantly idiomatic style, comprises the traditional history of the word and its significations as given by ancient Jewish authorities. In the Latin, also remarkable for its beauty, this history is further carried out by means of an extensive and most ingenious comparison with its cognates in sound and meaning among the principal languages of the Sanscritico-Shemitish stock, as the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, German, &c., together with the expressions by which it is rendered in the Chaldee Targums, the ancient Greek versions, and the Latin Vulgate.

Before making our remarks on the work of Dr. Fürst in its quality of concordance, we shall offer some observations on the *objects*, *plan*, *use*, and *history* of concordances to the Hebrew Bible.

I. The *objects* of a complete Hebrew concordance require that it should embrace the following particulars:

1. All the principal words both notional and relational contained in the Hebrew Scriptures.

2. All the forms in which they appear.

3. All the connexions in which these forms are severally to be found with the places where they occur.

1. Every language possesses, as its material, a greater or less number of words. These consist of *notional* words, or such as convey the idea either of a material or immaterial existence, or of an action or state of being; and *relational* words, or those which serve to point out the relations which

such existences and actions bear to each other. The words of the first class are divided into nouns, pronouns, and verbs; those of the second are collectively termed particles.

These words are either created immediately upon the conception of the ideas they convey, through the agency of the organs of speech, and hence receive the name of *primitives*; or they are constructed in various ways from the elements of other words already in existence and representing some analogous idea, whence they are called *derivatives*. Now as the formation of neither of these species of words can precede the conception of the ideas which they represent, and can at most only be contemporary with such conceptions, the number of words composing a nation's language must depend entirely on that of its ideas; or, in other words, on the nature of the external world by which it is surrounded, and the amount and quality of the intellectual cultivation it may receive.

But the circumstances of a people's existence are subject to continual changes, which exert a powerful influence on the national idiosyncrasy; consequently its stock of ideas, and together with them the words which serve as their exponents, will be liable to corresponding fluctuations, such as the introduction of new terms, the attributing of new significations to the old, and finally the rejection of them altogether. The changes superinduced in the language of a nation by its external circumstances are not more numerous than those which result from the improvement or deterioration of the general state of its intellectual culture; for the mental faculties of a nation, like those of an individual, may either remain through neglect in an undeveloped state, or be brought by assiduous cultivation to the highest perfection. And hence, as long as a people retain the same language for the communication of their wants, feelings, and ideas, its richness or poverty will serve as an exact index to the degree of development to which the national mind has attained.

As all living languages are in this constant state of mutation, it is impossible to construct lexicons for them which shall remain even tolerably complete for more than a limited space of time. This however is not the case with the Hebrew, which has ceased to be a living tongue for more than two thousand years, and whose whole authentic remains are contained in the small number of books composing the Old Testament. This fact, together with the important character of the sacred writings, on the knowledge of which our tem-

poral and eternal happiness depends, long ago suggested the idea of making a systematic collection of all the words contained in the Bible, with all their forms and connexions and the places in which they are found, to serve as a perpetual guide to the thorough understanding of the sacred volume. A concordance then differs from a lexicon principally in this, that while the chief object of the latter is the scientific exposition of the various shades of meaning which words convey, that of the former is to show where these words occur.

2. The notional words in Hebrew appear in a variety of forms, produced by changes in their vowels and consonants, and by the addition of initial and final augments. The principal changes to which verbs are subjected consist in the inflections made use of to distinguish the different species, modes, tenses, persons, and numbers, in which they are employed. Those which nouns undergo are produced by the influence of the pause accents, by passing from the absolute to the construct state, and in forming the plural number. Every part of speech may receive accessory letters of different kinds in the shape of prefixes and affixes. In the concordance all the forms to which these changes and additions give rise should constitute distinct heads arranged in a proper order; so that any one of them may instantly be found, and the number of times it occurs ascertained.

3. As the significations of words are affected in no slight degree by their various connexions, it is requisite, as we have already observed, that the concordance should give these connexions also, by quoting with sufficient fulness the passages in which a word is contained; and in order that the inquirer may be enabled to turn to their places in the text for his further satisfaction, they should be accompanied by references to the book, chapter, and verse whence they are taken.

II. Having now briefly described what the objects embraced by a concordance render necessary that it should contain, we next proceed to a delineation of the *plan* on which it should be conducted so as to facilitate its use to the utmost. In the first place, then, the author must decide upon what is to constitute the governing principle of the whole arrangement,—whether signification or grammatical form. He has next to determine upon the order in which to dispose the words, viz. whether to commence with the simple forms of a primitive word and its derivatives, and then give the different shapes arising from inflection and from the reception of prefixes and affixes; or whether first to go through all the

forms of the primitive and afterwards those of each derivative in regular succession. The proper arrangement of the quotations also demands some consideration; since various reasons may be urged in favour of placing the books in the order of the Hebrew Bible, in that of the Vulgate, or in that of the periods in which they were composed. These are some of the principal points which must engage the attention of the compiler of a Hebrew concordance; and on the justness of his conclusions with regard to them the utility of his work will in great measure depend.

In stating our own views on the subject we have no hesitation in giving the preference to a plan founded on the scientific principle of disposing words in the order of their grammatical development, and combining, as far as may be practicable, the advantages of the alphabetical arrangement. Thus, the verb should be divided into its several species of Kal, Niph'hal, Pi'hel, Pu'hal, Hiph'hil, Hoph'hal, and Hithpa'hel, and each treated separately in course. The modes of each species should succeed each other in the following order: the Indicative, comprising the preterite and future tenses; the Imperative, which being formed from the future, should be placed immediately after it; the Infinitive; and lastly the Participle, which as well as the infinitive is a verbal noun, and receives for the most part the same prefixes and suffixes as other nouns.

The two tenses should be subjected to a further subdivision depending on number and person, and arranged as follows: first, the third pers. masc. sing., since it usually constitutes the root of the verb; next, the third pers. fem. sing.; then, the sec. pers. masc. sing., &c., as laid down in most grammars of the language. For the sake of uniformity the same arrangement should be observed in the future tense, since no regular disposition of the persons can be effected by observing the alphabetical order of their preformatives. The persons of each tense are to be subdivided according to their vowel changes and the suffixes they may receive, and these again according to their prefixes. The imperative is to be treated in all respects like the future.

The infinitives and participles should be divided into absolute and construct, and the latter also into singular and plural. Besides these divisions, to which all other nouns are to be subjected, participles and adjectives are still further subdivided into masculine and feminine. Suffixes and prefixes give rise to new subdivisions in the nouns as well as in the verbs.

The order then in which the different parts of a verb and the nouns derived from it will succeed each other according to this method is as follows. First we have the third pers. masc. sing. preterite Kal of the verb, as for instance קָטַל, and immediately under it the passages of the Bible in which it appears. The next is the form קָטַל, which differs from the preceding only by a vowel change arising from the reception of a pause-accent; here too, as in all other instances, the quotations containing the word are placed directly beneath it. The same word is again given, accompanied by its prefixes; thus וְקָטַל, הִקָּטַל. It next appears with the pronominal suffixes, arranged in the order of the persons, first, second, and third; and each, like the nude form, with its prefixes, e. g. 1. וְקָטַלְנִי, הִקָּטַלְנִי, וְקָטַלְתָּ; 2 m. וְקָטַלְתָּ, &c. &c. When the third pers. masc. sing. of the verb is thus disposed of, the third pers. fem. is treated in the same manner; and so on through all the persons and both numbers of the preterite, future, and imperative of the Kal species.

After the imperative are placed the verbal nouns belonging to the species, viz. the infinitive and participle. The infinitive is given first in the nude form of the absolute, as קָטַל, and then with ה interrogative and , conjunctive. This is followed by the construct state, first with the prepositions בְּ, לְ, אֶל, alone; and next with the personal pronouns both without and with the prepositions, thus וְקָטַלְתָּ, בְּקָטַלְתָּ, &c.; וְקָטַלְתָּ, בְּקָטַלְתָּ, &c. &c. Of the participles active and passive the masculine form is gone through first, both singular and plural, and afterwards the feminine; both numbers being subjected to a subdivision according to their suffixes and prefixes, similar to that of the infinitive.

All the forms belonging to Kal being thus exhausted, the remaining species are treated in the same manner, until the entire verb has been disposed of. The derivative nouns from the same root are then taken up, beginning with the simplest and ending with the most complex: accordingly we have first those which are derived from the root by a mere vowel change, next those which receive a preformative or affirmative letter or syllable, and lastly such as take both.

The passages quoted from the Bible should succeed each other in the order of chronology, as this will assist the inquirer in ascertaining the comparative antiquity of the various senses in which a word may be employed.

III. The above is our opinion as to the mode which should

be pursued in constructing a Hebrew concordance so as to be most conveniently and profitably consulted. We have now to speak concerning the *uses* to which a properly executed work of this description is capable of being applied. In so doing, our remarks will apply to the assistance it gives, 1. to an editor of the Hebrew Scriptures, as affording the best means of restoring and preserving the purity of the text; 2. to the Hebrew lexicographer and grammarian; 3. to the interpreter of Scripture and to biblical students in general.

1. The most important service which a concordance renders to the editor of a Hebrew Bible, is that of enabling him, by consulting the fragments of the Masora, to apply at once to the original sources of information respecting the true orthography of doubtful words, instead of being under the necessity of blindly following in the track of his predecessors, perpetuating if not indeed aggravating the errors they may have committed. In order to place this fact in its clearest light, we will here give a brief account of the Masora itself.

The word *Masora* (מסורה), or *Masoreth* (מסורת), signifying *tradition*, is used to denote a collection of critical remarks relative to the text of the Hebrew Scriptures, which, according to the Talmudists, was settled by the High Synod, an assembly of the most wise and learned men of the Jewish nation, constituted immediately after the return from the Babylonian captivity, with Ezra the high priest at their head. These are said to have collected the numerous ancient traditions respecting the divisions, verses, words, letters, and points of the Bible, and to have employed them in a thorough revision of the text, undertaken with the view of restoring it if possible to its pristine purity, and of guarding against its subsequent deterioration. The mass of ancient critical remarks thus brought together, with the additions made to them by the members of the Synod, continued to be preserved and taught in the schools of Judea until about the middle of the third century of the Christian era, when the chief seat of Jewish learning was removed to Babylon. There, according to the Jewish Chronicles, it continued to flourish for a space of eight hundred years, when at length the schools were broken up, and the learned men scattered through Spain and other parts of Europe. About the beginning of the sixteenth century the fragments of the Masora were collected, revised, and published by R. Jacob ben Hhayim in the Rabbinical Bible printed by Daniel Bomberg at Venice.

The Masora is divided into *greater* and *less*; or, *more*

properly speaking, there are two Masoras, which respectively bear these appellations. The greater Masora, which formerly constituted a large independent work, is printed in Bomberg's Bible in the margin of the text, both above and beneath it, and likewise down the side when the brevity of the Rabbinical commentary leaves room. It states the number of times that words of uncommon occurrence are to be found in the Pentateuch or in the whole Bible; how often words appear in unusual connexions; how often they receive certain vowels and accents; and how often words usually written fully, i. e. with one of the semivowels, are to be found defective or without them, and *vice versa*. It also points out the K'ri and C'thibh, and records the number of sections, verses, words, and even letters in each book and in the entire Bible. The lesser Masora consists of extracts from the greater, and is commonly placed between the text and the Rabbinical commentaries. It is composed chiefly of numeral letters and abbreviations, showing how often certain words occur in the Bible, but without quoting or referring to the passages where they are found, except in the case of such as appear only twice. The greater Masora gives the passages although not their places.

Many attempts have been made by Jewish writers to determine the date of the origin of the Masoretic scholia, and to account for the various readings they exhibit, without at the same time impugning the integrity of the sacred text. The principal opinions broached by them on this subject are as follows.

Aphodi, in the seventh chapter of his grammatical treatise, says that "Ezra the high priest endeavoured to correct all the faults of manuscripts, as did also to the utmost of their abilities the learned men who succeeded him, in order that they might hand them down to us in a perfect state. To this end they numbered the sections, verses, words, and letters of the Bible, noting those words which were written fully, defectively, and irregularly, together with the different opinions of the learned concerning them. All these observations they collected into books, which form the fragments of the Masora; and in those places where they found mistakes or disputes, they put the various readings in the form of K'ri and C'thibh."

With this statement Kimhhi in the main agrees. In the preface to his commentary on the historical books of the Old Testament he observes: "It would appear that these words (*viz.* those with respect to which a diversity of opinion is expressed in the Masora) were found variously written in dif-

ferent manuscripts: for during the first captivity the sacred books became lost or corrupted, and the learned men died; so that when the High Synod, who undertook the restoration of the text, found their manuscripts to disagree, they followed the majority in the text, and placed the variations in the margin."

This theory of Aphodi and Kimhhi, however, is strongly opposed by Abarbanel in the preface to his commentary on Jeremiah, where he makes the following remarks: "1st. How can any one believe and maintain that Ezra could possibly have found the Book of the Law and the Prophets defective or corrupt—that Book of which, if a single word or letter be wanting, no use can ever be made? yet according to these writers there must be wanting many letters!

"2dly. If it were true that after Ezra's having found in the manuscripts corrupt or doubtful words, he, being uncertain as to which was the true reading, placed one in the text and the other in the margin, or pointed the words in the text according to a reading different from that indicated by the letters, wherefore do we always adhere to the K'ri and disregard the C'thibh? or wherefore did Ezra always point according to the K'ri? and if he considered those to be the genuine readings, why did he not insert them in the text, and place the C'thibh in the margin?

"3dly. If the K'ri and C'thibh owe their origin to the corruptions that took place during the captivity, and thus be the work of mere accident, whence comes it that the same word appears in different places with the same K'ri and C'thibh? Thus, for example, we frequently find צבאים in the K'ri for צביים in the C'thibh, נער for נערה; and always טחורים for עפלים, and ישגלנה for ישכבנה, which cannot assuredly be the result of chance."

The conclusion to which Abarbanel comes, is, that Ezra and his contemporaries found the Book of the Law in a perfect condition. He supposes that Ezra, before settling the vowel-points, accents, and the division into verses, subjected the text to a thorough revision; and that those words which exhibited some singularity of form or construction he either considered as written so intentionally and with some mysterious import, on which account he left them as they stood in the text, and placed in the margin the word or form which grammatical analogy or the context seemed to require; or possibly he regarded them as arising from negligence or ignorance of the proper orthography, in short as errors of the

prophet's own making (בשגגה היוצא מלפני השליט), and therefore, not venturing to alter the writings of those who spoke by inspiration, inserted in the margin his corrections, in making which he doubtless only followed the opinions of antiquity which had reached him by tradition.

This writer is opposed in turn by R. Jacob ben Hhayim, the editor of Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible. Although he agrees with Abarbanel in rejecting the supposition of Aphodi and Kimhhi, that Ezra found the manuscripts to differ from each other; yet he will not allow that the K'ri could in any way have proceeded from Ezra, it being contrary to the authority of the Talmud, which declares that Moses received them on Mount Sinai. Thus R. Gedalya, in Shalsheth Hakkabala, says, "I am persuaded that all these things, (i. e. those of which the Masora treats) were delivered to Moses on Sinai, and afterwards neglected and forgotten in the lapse of time; or else they were never committed to writing, until the members of the Great Synod performed that service, and communicated them to all Israel." The same sentiments are delivered by R. Isaac in the Mikra Sopherim.

From this, says Ben Hhayim, it is evident that the K'ri are to be considered as a series of observations on certain strange forms of the C'thibh, collected indeed and applied by Ezra, but proceeding from Moses himself; while the hypothesis of Abarbanel, that they may have originated in the carelessness of the prophets, is scarcely worthy a serious refutation. For how can it for a moment be imagined that the inspired penmen were liable to error from such a cause? and if they had suffered an occasional orthographical mistake to escape them in the ardour of composition, is it to be supposed that they would not afterwards have taken the pains to correct them? Yet we find the same K'ri and C'thibh repeatedly occurring in Jeremiah, whose prophecy contains *one hundred and thirty-three* of these various readings!

Again, in the tract Sopherim (ch. 6) it is stated that three manuscripts were found by Ezra; that in one of them was written מעון אלהי קרם, and in the other two מעונה וגוי, upon which he adopted the latter reading and disregarded the former. So too he found in one manuscript ואל זטוי בני ישראל and in the remaining two ואל אצילי בני ישראל, and in like manner decided according to the majority. From this R. Jacob proceeds to argue against the opinion of Abarbanel that Ezra wrote the K'ri because he doubted the correctness of the C'thibh; for, says he, if this were true, why did he not, as in

the cases just mentioned, consult the manuscripts in his possession, and follow the testimony of the majority? And if all the manuscripts agreed, why did he not show how those words are to be read in the synagogue roll, concerning which it is commanded that not one letter be pronounced which is not written? Again, if Ezra were in reality the author of the K'ri, how could the custom which now obtains ever have arisen, of reading in accordance with it and neglecting the C'thibh, which all acknowledge to have proceeded from the finger of God? In this way he comes to the conclusion, agreeably to the doctrine of the Talmud, that all the K'ri and C'thibh were delivered to Moses on Sinai, excepting the instances mentioned in the tract Sopherim, where Ezra was in doubt, in consequence of the discrepancy of manuscripts, and followed the majority.

Yet, notwithstanding the great antiquity and consequent high authority, which are thus ascribed to the Masora, we meet with a number of cases in which the Masora and the Talmud disagree. Thus we read in the tract Nidda: "In the passage והנשא אותם יכבס כגדיו (Lev. 15: 10), the word והנשא is written defectively;" but the Masora affirms it to be written fully. In the tract Shabbath, Rabbi Huna says, "In the word מעבירים (1 Sam. 2: 24), the plural termination is defective." Jarchi expresses his astonishment at this, and declares it to be erroneous; since the most correct editions give the word fully מעבירים, and the great Masora makes no mention of its being defective. Jarchi, however, was not warranted in contravening the statement of R. Huna on this latter account, since he himself is frequently found to differ from the Masora; and in this he is by no means alone among the Rabbinical writers.

In consequence of the opinion expressed by the Talmudists relative to the origin of the Masora, to which they give the name of סניג לתורה, or *hedge around the law*, it has for ages been regarded as an authority superior to the Talmud itself. And although we cannot concur in assigning to the Masora the high antiquity claimed for it, or in considering the various readings which it points out as indicative of certain mysterious significations, we are still compelled to acknowledge the unwearied assiduity of those men, whoever they were, who exerted their best efforts in endeavouring to remove from the written word of God the slight yet numerous imperfections by which it had gradually become defaced. The Masora in fact is a most important and useful collection of an-

cient critical remarks, the constant consultation of which is indispensably necessary to every editor of a Hebrew Bible who is inspired with the laudable ambition of improving upon the labours of those who have gone before him; for the mind gifted with the highest critical powers will not refuse assent to the truth of the Talmudic axiom: the older the tradition, the greater its authenticity (כל הישן מחבירו הוי יפה מחבירו).

But how are the secret recesses of the Masora to be penetrated, and its abundant materials rendered accessible for use? This can be accomplished only with the assistance of a competent guide, and such a guide is the concordance. By means of it the inquirer is enabled to ascertain, from the forms and connexions of the words referred to by the Masora, their places in the Bible; and is thus relieved from the necessity of relying upon the correctness and completeness of the testimony of others. The learned Ben Hhayim thus expresses his sense of the services rendered him by R. Nathan's Concordance (of which hereafter) in making use of the Masora, as well as in collecting its fragments from the different manuscripts in which it was contained:

"In performing the revision of the biblical text, the task of finding out the verses would have been impossible for me, without knowing the whole of the Bible by heart, which I do not; so that if I had not had the assistance of a book called a concordance, which a learned man, R. Isaac Nathan by name, about forty years ago composed and printed here at Venice, I must have resigned my undertaking. This is a precious work, which enumerates and explains all the members of the Holy Scriptures, placing every noun and verb with its like, and stating at the head the meaning or meanings of each word, according to which the different passages are divided and enumerated, with references to book, chapter, and verse; so that one may find any word both quickly and easily. The advantages of such a work are incalculable, and without it the Masora cannot be made use of: for if we wish to find a verse which it (the Masora) quotes, we know not in what book it is to be sought; and should we happen to know the book, we have still to hunt out the section and the verse. Whoever possesses this book, can dispense with Kimhhi's Otsar Hashshorashim:* in short, deprived of its aid, I never could have performed what I have."

* We have already mentioned the high estimation in which this lexicon is held among the Jews.

2. The utility of the concordance is not limited to furnishing good editions of the Sacred Scriptures; it likewise extends to the obtaining of an accurate knowledge of their contents. This it accomplishes in good measure by the aid it affords the Hebrew lexicographer. We shall, perhaps, make ourselves better understood, if we commence our remarks on this topic by concisely stating the objects which the lexicographer should have in view, and the means at his command for effecting them.

The principal objects then of the Hebrew lexicographer should be, to ascertain the primitive words or roots of the language; to exhibit in the natural order of their development the derivatives which spring from them; to state the primary and secondary significations of each of these classes of words; and to show the degree of relationship which the various meanings of words from the same root bear to each other and to the primitive idea.

In order to comply with these numerous requisitions (supposing him to be without the assistance of any previous work of the kind), he must begin by seeking out all the words in the Bible, and arranging them under their several roots in the order of their derivation and inflection. This done, he has next to ascertain their precise significations, in which he is aided by the meanings of words from cognate roots; the context, which frequently either settles the meaning of a word beyond a doubt, or furnishes the strongest presumptive evidence towards a decision; the ancient versions and commentaries, which often contain important traditional information, reaching back to the period when the language was yet a living one; and lastly, the cognate dialects, which the great progress made of late years in the science of comparative philology renders of immense utility.

Of all the means which the lexicographer has thus at his disposal, those afforded by the Bible itself, in exhibiting all the forms and connexions in which words are employed, undoubtedly rank the first. And it is only when this evidence has been carefully consulted, that other sources of information are to be resorted to, either for the purpose of confirming the testimony when sufficiently full and explicit, or of completing it when defective. One who, neglecting this fundamental precept, hastens to other quarters in search of aid, before having completely ascertained and duly considered that which the sacred volume offers for its own elucidation, runs into imminent danger להניח זרים בהיכל הקודש שלא לצורך

“of leading strangers into the holy temple without need,” an error which has already been too often committed, and is even now by no means of unfrequent occurrence.

In Hebrew, as in other languages, some primitive words have few or no derivatives, while from others a large number are formed in a great variety of ways. Again, in some cases derivative words are found to have survived their primitives, which can now be discovered only by analogy, or by having recourse to the cognate tongues. A word has often many different shades of meaning, which depend in a great measure on the connexions in which it is placed. The significations too of the various forms which a word assumes, as, for example, the several species of the verb, often differ essentially from each other; while those of its derivatives are still more widely separated. These derivative words and meanings, however, must all, if possible, be exhibited in a natural relation to each other as well as to the original word and its primary signification.

The means for prosecuting the inquiries necessary to the proper accomplishment of this object are abundantly furnished by the Hebrew concordance. For, besides exhibiting all the words of the Bible with their connexions and the places where found, it is also of essential service in consulting the ancient Jewish glosses and interpretations. These, although containing much that may be made available for lexicographical purposes, are yet composed with such a total want of system, that access to the valuable hints they afford respecting the etymology of words can often be obtained only by means of a concordance; the reason being that a word is often passed by several times without remark, and is afterwards commented upon when occurring in some subsequent passage.

Of no less importance is the concordance to the Hebrew grammarian. As far as relates to the doctrine of the derivation of words, and the modifications of meaning accompanying the changes in form which take place in the process, the several duties of the lexicographer and grammarian may be said to coincide. But in addition to this, the latter is required to ascertain the laws on which depend the orthographical changes arising during inflection, and to account on natural principles for the origin of such forms as may deviate more or less from those in which the genius of the language usually exhibits itself. Besides these subjects of inquiry, which belong to the department of etymology, the grammarian has

also to investigate the principles which regulate the use of all these forms and inflections for the purpose of expressing the various operations of the human mind, and which constitute what is called the syntax.

Now the facts from which a knowledge of these principles as relates to the Hebrew language is to be derived, lie scattered through the Bible; and they must first be collected and systematized before the grammarian can hope to obtain that comprehensive view of them which is indispensable to his success. Thus, in order to ascertain the rules on which the inflections of nouns depend, it is necessary to trace a number of individuals of this part of speech through all the modifications of which they are susceptible. But what an expenditure of time and labour would it require, to hunt for them through a book of such extent as the Hebrew Bible? The difficulties in the way of making similar investigations with regard to the verbs, owing to the number and variety of their forms, would be, if not insurmountable, at least incomparably greater. In addition to the regular inflections of the language, the abnormal forms, as we have already observed, must also be stated and explained in the grammar; yet how is this to be done in a proper manner unless every passage be known in which a given word in any of its forms occurs? The concordance alone can give the information required.

3. If it be allowed that the concordance serves as the foundation to Hebrew lexicons and grammars, and is consequently superior in authority to them all, it follows that it must be of the greatest value to the biblical interpreter, whose success in elucidating the Scriptures depends in good measure on the extent and accuracy of his knowledge of the language in which they are contained. Moreover, the strength of the intelligent interpreter consists chiefly in bringing forward new suggestions on difficult points, and in supporting them by the appropriate citation of parallel passages, which makes the Bible its own expositor; for this the concordance is peculiarly intended. He will also find it of great assistance in turning to the productions of the ancient Jewish commentators, which, owing to their absence of method, would otherwise be exceedingly difficult to consult.

The use of the concordance in an exegetical point of view is not confined to the finished Hebrew scholar, who aims at carrying forward the science of the language; it extends also to the far more numerous class of students who have acquired sufficient knowledge of it to enable them to consult, and even

peruse their Hebrew Bibles, but who do not possess that familiar acquaintance with its minutiae, which alone can confer the power of deciding in all cases with certainty respecting grammatical forms. The liability of such to error is greatest with respect to the most important part of speech, viz. the verbs, of which there are a multitude of similar and abnormal forms, the confounding of which may lead to serious errors of interpretation. A concordance in a great measure obviates these difficulties; since, by presenting the student in regular order with all the forms of every word, it affords an instantaneous solution of many a doubt, which he might be unable to solve by means of the grammar and lexicon alone.

From the preceding observations on the utility of the concordance to different classes of scholars, it will be obvious that it constitutes the foundation of the whole apparatus of biblical learning. This has so long been apparent to those who have reflected on the subject, that even while the art of printing was yet in its infancy, and when the undertaking of large and expensive publications was attended with much greater difficulty and risk of pecuniary loss than at the present day, we find voluminous concordances in different languages issuing from the press, whose magnitude and laborious execution challenges our admiration.

4. We will now complete what we have to say on concordances in general by a short history of such works to the present time. And as our principal object in undertaking this sketch is to give an account of concordances to the Hebrew Bible, we will first briefly mention those compiled for the Latin Vulgate, previous to the publication of the first of the Hebrew concordances, and then confine our observations to the latter.

The author of the first Latin concordance, or rather of the first rudiments of one, for it appears to have been little more, was Antonio de Padua, a Spanish Franciscan, who lived during the pontificate of Gregory IX., and who for his wonderful facility in quoting the Scriptures received from that Pope the title Ark of the Covenant. He died in 1231. The second concordance to the Vulgate, which indeed was the first worthy of the name, was the production of the celebrated Cardinal Hugo, considered by many to have been the author of the existing division of the Bible into chapters, and who died at Rome in the year 1262. His work included only the common nouns and verbs. The third of the kind

was that of Pere Arloto, a native of Tuscany, who lived under the emperor Adolphus, about the close of the thirteenth century. With him was contemporary Conrad of Halberstadt, a German priest and professor of theology, who rendered the concordance more complete by the introduction of the particles. This department, however, remained in an extremely defective state until the year 1430, when Johannes de Segovia, a Toledan canon, published one containing the particles alone, which cost himself and an assistant the labour of five years.

The first concordance to the Hebrew Bible was that composed by Rabbi Isaac* Nathan, who was occupied in the work ten years, and completed it in 1448. According to the account given by himself in the preface, it was a mere translation or counterpart of a Latin concordance, which R. Gedalya in his historical work, the *Shalsheth Hakkabala*, affirms to have been that of Arloto. The principal inducement to this undertaking, as R. Nathan assures us, was, that he might furnish his co-religionists with a controversial weapon which had been employed against himself by Christian theologians with the greatest effect. So high was his opinion of the value of such a work, and so earnestly did he desire to see it in the hands of his people, that he confesses himself to have hastened its publication at the expense of its completeness.

We find accordingly, on examining the work, that it contains only the principal words of the language, the verbs and nouns. The omission of the particles he endeavours to excuse, partly on the ground of their want of independent signification, and partly on that of the immense number of times they occur, which would have rendered their insertion a task infinitely tedious and laborious. For this reason also he omits the proper names. The execution of the work does not betray those marks of haste which the author's impatience in urging it forward might lead us to expect; but we cannot say as much for its plan, which is both ill-digested and inconvenient. Of this the following sketch will suffice.

* In the title of his work he is styled R. *Mordecai* Nathan, and in the preface R. *Isaac*. This discrepancy is conjectured by Buxtorf, with great probability, to have been the result of a severe sickness, during which he changed his name; a practice observed even among the Jews of the present day, and which is prescribed in the Talmud, with the view that the sufferer may thenceforth be regarded by God as a new being, and thus be delivered from the fate to which he appeared devoted.

The roots are in large square characters without points, and accompanied by their meanings in Rabbinic Hebrew. Under each one are arranged all the words belonging to it, without any other regard to system than the placing of them according to the books of the Bible in which they are found. Thus, for example, under the root אבר is first given the head בראשית (Genesis), and immediately after it all the passages of this book which contain any form of any word belonging to אבר, with references at the side to chapter and verse in Hebrew numerals; next follow all the passages from Exodus under the head שמות, and afterwards, in regular succession, those from the remaining books. A feature of the work which we have not yet noticed is, that whenever a root has two or more significations, each of them is made to constitute a great division, under which are placed all the passages in which, according to the author's opinion, that particular meaning obtains. In carrying out this part of his plan he appears to have experienced no inconsiderable degree of difficulty; for, besides placing words under the wrong signification, which he not unfrequently does, we find that he sometimes inserts the same passage under different heads, as though unable or unwilling to decide as to the proper one. Words which are derived from roots formed by the addition of different weak letters and liquids to a common biliteral theme, and bearing the same general meaning, are placed by the author together under the trilateral most in use; in this manner he intermingles words from איש and אנש, from בוש and יבש, from ישב and נשב, from קצה and קיץ, &c. Since his chief object was to enable the inquirer to find a given word or passage, he takes no notice of words written fully or defectively, or of the K'ri or C'thibh. The Hebrew Bible having not yet been divided into chapters, he makes use of the divisions of the Latin Vulgate which he found in his original; the references to them are by no means free from errors, yet they are far from abounding to the degree which might have been anticipated from the hasty manner in which the book was published.

One of the most serious faults of R. Nathan's plan is that of arranging words in the order of the places where they occur, and not according to their grammatical forms. By this means serious obstacles are presented to the ready consultation of the work even for the purpose of finding a given word or passage; for should the inquirer not know beforehand in what book it is to be found, he will probably be compelled to wade through several pages of quotations before obtaining the in-

formation required. These inconveniences are greatly augmented in the case of the lexicographer or grammarian, who desires to know to what derivatives each root has given birth and in what forms they are used; since to ascertain this he must examine each article from beginning to end, in order that facts may not escape him which a properly constructed concordance would exhibit at a single glance.*

The first edition of R. Nathan's Concordance was published by Daniel Bomberg at Venice in 1523; and the second by Ambrose Froben, the son of the friend and patron of Erasmus, at Basle, in 1581; this corrected some of the errors of the former, but introduced no improvements. The third was that of Mario de Calasio, Hebrew professor at Rome, which appeared in 1621 in four volumes folio. Many of the errors both in the quotations and references of the preceding editions were here corrected; yet the general plan of the work was suffered to remain untouched. Its immense increase in size was in part owing to the insertion of most of the Chaldee words in Daniel and Ezra, the appending of a Latin translation to Nathan's expositions of the meanings of the roots with additions by the editor, and the citation and explanation of cognate terms and synonyms from the Rabbinic, Aramaic, and Arabic. But what principally contributed to swell the bulk of this edition was a literal Latin version of all the quoted passages placed at the side of the text, with citations in the margin of the places in which the Septuagint and Vulgate differ from the interpretation given. The proper names of persons and places were also added in the form of an appendix.

The radical defects and numerous errors which still disfigured the Hebrew concordance caused the elder Buxtorf to undertake the compilation of a new one, which, besides being more complete and correct than either of its predecessors, should also be arranged on a more scientific and convenient plan. To this he was especially induced by the essential service the concordance had rendered him in editing Bomberg's rabbinical Bible, even while his attention was continually drawn to its many imperfections. The admirable performance in which his labours resulted was published after his death under the superintendence of his learned son,

* What will the reader think when informed that we have now before us a prospectus lately issued in London for the publication of a concordance, dedicated by permission to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, which is faithfully to copy the very plan we have now been deprecating?

at Basle, in 1632, and has been the standard work ever since. As the chief merit of Buxtorf's Concordance consists rather in its new and excellent plan than in the amount of its corrections and additions, we will describe it somewhat in detail.

The roots are arranged in the same manner as in Kimhhi's lexicon, that is, the triliterals are placed in alphabetical order and the multiliterals are collected together at the end of each letter of the alphabet. The root is followed by R. Nathan's Hebrew exposition and its substance in Latin. The various inflections of the root and its derivatives then succeed each other in regular grammatical order. Not only every word, but also every one of its forms, whether arising from the mere change of a vowel or consonant, or from the reception of an augment, is made to constitute a separate head. These are printed in smaller characters than the root, and are accompanied by a Latin translation, and followed by the passages from the Bible in which they occur, with reference to book, chapter, and verse.

The verb is given first, beginning with the Kal species in all its modes, tenses, numbers, and persons, and proceeding with the remainder in the order in which they are treated in the grammars. Each species is subdivided as follows: 1. The Preterite tense, the persons of which are placed in the order of third, second, and first; the reason, as we have before mentioned, being that the third person constitutes the root. Each person is divided into several heads according to the suffixes it receives, and these are subjected to a further subdivision depending on the prefixes. 2. The Participles, subdivided according to their numbers, genders, suffixes, and prefixes. 3. The Infinitive in all its forms. 4. The Imperative. 5. The Future tense, divided and subdivided in the same manner as the preterite, excepting only the arrangement of the persons, which is here reversed, probably because the first commences with *א*. When the verb has been completed, the nouns belonging to the same root are introduced in the order of their development. These as well as the infinitives and participles are divided according to their inflections and to the suffixes and prefixes they may receive, in the manner prescribed in the portion of our article relating to the plan of a concordance.

The concordance is thus made to embrace all the verbs and common nouns of the language extant in the Bible, excepting a few that are not inserted on account of their extremely frequent occurrence. The particles, whether derived

from verbs or nouns, are entirely omitted, as are also the proper names. The biblical Chaldee, added by the younger Buxtorf, is not intermingled with the Hebrew, but is placed by itself at the end of the volume. The words of the quoted passages are in general given fully or defectively, as they stand in the text, but the various readings indicated by the K'ri and C'thibh are allowed to go unnoticed. The references to book, chapter, and verse, are given, as in the work of R. Nathan, in Hebrew letters; the order of the books adopted by the latter, which, as we have seen, is that of the Vulgate, is likewise retained.

Buxtorf succeeded in a great measure in correcting the most prominent faults of his predecessor by constructing his plan on a grammatical basis, not only separating the primitive and derivative words, but also making each form of a word a distinct head. These improvements rendered the concordance so well adapted to the uses for which it is designed, that the work of Buxtorf retained its preëminence for more than two centuries, a proud testimony to the extensive learning, and the praiseworthy industry of its author. When speaking of the deficiencies which the advanced state of modern science enables us to discern in the works of such men, we should do it in the spirit of filial veneration which prompted the Talmudic expression employed by himself with reference to his predecessors: *מקום הניחו אבותינו להתגדר בו* *our fathers have left room for improvement.*

The faults of plan and execution with which the work of Buxtorf is fairly chargeable, although comparatively few, are yet sufficiently numerous to render an improved edition desirable, and indeed necessary for the present age. The defects of its plan are seen chiefly in the lexicographical portion, and in the influence this was suffered to exert upon the conduct of the entire work. Although it is not clear that a concordance should be required to embody a lexicon within itself, yet when this is undertaken, it is to be expected that it will offer at least the results of the most important lexicographical discoveries and improvements that have been made till the time of its publication. As we have already mentioned, the lexicographical remarks of Buxtorf are taken almost wholly from the meagre statements of R. Nathan respecting the significations of words as determined by their use in the Bible, or by Rabbinical commentators. This perhaps was doing as much as could be expected in the then state of lexicographical science; but as every department of

philology has of late years been brought to a higher point of perfection than at any former period, Buxtorf's work has come to be regarded with all its acknowledged excellence as wanting in many important particulars.

The influence which Buxtorf's lexicographical views had upon the arrangement of the concordance was of greater detriment than their more immediate consequences, since they caused him to follow Nathan in arranging the words of each root under the several meanings assigned to it in the outset. The author's intention in so doing was doubtless to increase the value of his work to students of the Hebrew, by affording them the means of ascertaining with certainty the literal meaning of every passage of Scripture. But in reality this was a serious defect, since by distributing passages which contain the same word under various heads, the work is rendered more troublesome to consult, and, what is worse, the chief ends of a concordance are in a great measure defeated by fettering the judgment of the lexicographer and interpreter, for whose decisions it should merely furnish the materials.

These faults in the plan of Buxtorf's work in addition to many in its execution, as for instance the omission of hundreds of citations and even entire articles, besides a multitude of typographical errors, all combine to insure a favourable reception for a new concordance designed to embody the improvements which the progress of philological science, and the accumulation of materials, have now rendered both practicable and requisite. And we feel happy in being able to state, after a careful examination of the work of Dr. Julius Fürst, that as a concordance it completely answers every reasonable demand, while its excellence in point of lexicography is such as to exceed the most sanguine expectations. This latter subject we have already discussed in the early part of our article; it therefore remains for us only to offer a few observations on the author's concordance, properly so called, as distinguished from that of Buxtorf.

He gives in the same manner and order as Buxtorf the forms of words both primitive and derivative; but by placing together all the passages which contain words agreeing in form and grammatical derivation, and differing only in use, he leaves the precise significations of words to be ascertained from the connexions, aided by his own masterly etymologico-historical illustrations, and thus avoids the grave error into which Buxtorf had suffered himself to be led by the example

of his predecessor, Rabbi Nathan. Dr. Fürst has likewise endeavoured to combine the double advantages of the alphabetic and scientific modes of arrangement, by inserting in the order of the alphabet the forms of such derivatives from imperfect roots as do not contain all the radical letters. These are accompanied by references to the pages in which they regularly occur according to their etymology, and cannot but prove very acceptable to students not perfectly familiar with the niceties of formation. The insertion of the Chaldee words in the body of the work immediately after their respective Hebrew equivalents, we regard as another decided improvement, since it affords the means of readily comparing the uses of a word in both languages, which often throw considerable light on one another.

Besides these advantages in the plan of Dr. Fürst's concordance, it also excels that of Buxtorf in completeness. This is chiefly observable in the following points.

1. He inserts some entire articles, verbs as well as nouns, which Buxtorf, after R. Nathan, had omitted on account of their frequent occurrence.

2. He inserts all the particles, both Hebrew and Chaldee, which are derived from verbs.

3. He gives many hundred quotations more than Buxtorf. These he obtained partly from an examination and comparison of various lexicographical works, and partly from the collections of other scholars to which he was allowed access. Among these latter was one of more than six hundred passages noted in a copy of Buxtorf by the learned Jewish grammarian, Wolff Heidenheim. The effects of this large accession of materials soon became apparent; thus under

אָבִי Buxtorf cites *two* passages and Fürst *four*.

אֲבִיכֶם Buxtorf has not Gen. 31: 9, given by Fürst; it should, however, have been referred to 31: 8.

אֲבִיהֶם Buxtorf omits Num. 30: 5, and Judg. 19: 3, which Fürst inserts.

אֲבִיהֶם Fürst gives three passages not found in Buxtorf, viz. 2 Chron. 7: 22, 30: 7, 22, &c. &c.

Dr. Fürst is also more correct than his predecessor in many minor details. For example, Buxtorf places אָבִיר Deut. 32: 28 under the head אָבִיר, תָּכַף Deut. 13: 1 under תָּכַף, 1 Sam. 13: 24 under לָאֲבִי; the form לָאֲבִי is likewise retained in quoting the passage under רָעָה. All these errors Dr. Fürst corrects. He also makes a better choice of the words to be included in the quotations than Buxtorf; thus under אָב, in-

stead of כל מאה אב לבית Num. 17: 17, he gives in preference מטה מטה לבית אב.

The most numerous errors in Buxtorf are to be found among the references, which, as we have before observed, are given by him in Hebrew letters. These have been subjected to a strict revision by Dr. Fürst, who has greatly lessened the liability to the future recurrence of such mistakes, by exchanging the Hebrew numerals for Arabic figures. We will not detain the reader with a long enumeration of mistakes of this class; a few, with their accompanying corrections by Dr. Fürst, will suffice. Thus we have under אב Lam. 4: 28, for 5: 3. Prov. 15: 2, for 15: 20. (this was not properly corrected by Dr. Fürst, who, not observing that כ = 2 had erroneously been put for כ = 20, omitted the passage altogether); under לאב Jer. 31: 8, for 31: 9; Ezek. 44: 26, for 44: 25; under אבנו Num. 26: 27, for 26: 3; Is. 64: 8, for 64: 7, &c. &c.

Over and above the improvements introduced into the body of the work, of which we have attempted to give something like an adequate idea, the following additions are promised by the author in the form of appendices:

1. An etymologico-alphabetical index of all the words in the Old Testament, with references to the pages of the Concordance where they are to be found.

2. An index purely alphabetical, with references like the preceding.

3. A tabular view of all the forms of nouns systematically arranged according to their origin and formation.

4. All the particles in alphabetical order.

5. An alphabetical list of all the Aramaic, Talmudic, and modern Hebrew words explained in the lexicographical part of the Concordance, with references to the places where they are introduced. This will be so large as to form an almost complete Aramaic and Rabbinic lexicon.

6. An alphabetical list of all Hebrew proper names.

7. The Hebrew verbal roots alphabetically arranged in a tabular form, according to the relations shown to exist between them and those of the six other families of languages belonging to the ancient world.

8. A complete collection of the fragments of the Masora, with an introduction containing a full history of it, and with notes showing the points of difference between the Masora and the received biblical text.

9. A chronological table of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Combining such great and manifold advantages, the Concordance of Dr. Fürst may be affirmed with the greatest truth to be superior in all respects to every other that has hitherto been published, Buxtorf's not excepted. The only fault of consequence that we have detected, is a certain negligence in following out the minutiae of the plan laid down. The different forms of words do not invariably succeed each other in the order generally observed: thus, the participle, which usually precedes the future tense, is placed after it in the Pi'hel of בָּרַל; and sometimes the suffixes are made secondary to the prefixes in regulating the subdivision of the forms, which is contrary to the general practice. The books of the Bible are not always quoted in the same order, and in some instances they are even mingled together in a promiscuous mass, as for example under אֵל and אֱלֹהִים. Such slight defects as these, however, cannot be considered as materially detracting from the extraordinary merit of the work. On the contrary, the talents, learning, and industry displayed by its author, with the splendid style of its typographical execution, are such as to demand the admiration of all competent judges, and do honour to the age and country in which it is produced.

ART. II.—*The Life of John Calvin, the Great Reformer.*
By Paul Henry, D.D. Berlin. Volume II. 1838.*

It is almost two years since we gave an extended notice of M. Henry's first volume, and we laid it down in the confident expectation that long before this time we should see the completion of the work. It is, however, still unfinished; nor need any one be surprised at this, who considers the Augean labour of decyphering and correcting ancient manuscripts, not to speak of other more ordinary toils pertaining to the enterprise. The volume before us, though larger than the first, brings down the history no later than the year 1549, so that we must look for at least another volume.

* Das Leben Johann Calvins des grossen Reformators: mit Benutzung der handschriftlichen Urkunden, vornehmlich der Genfer und Zuericher Bibliothek, entworfen, nebst einem Anhang bisher unbedruckter Briefe und anderer Belege; von Paul Henry, Dr. der Theologie, Prediger und Seminar-Inspector zu Berlin. Hamburg. 1838. pp. 660, 8vo.

We see no cause to retract any of the commendations which we bestowed on M. Henry as a biographer. He is acute, impartial, pious, and indefatigable. At the same time we should be much more gratified if two German traits were absent from the plan of the work. The first of these is the needless prolixity with which the author goes into every question of doctrine or discipline, which may be suggested by the train of facts; it is this which swells the volumes to inordinate size. The other fault is, in our judgment, a greater deformity: it is the unreasonable attempt to methodize the narrative under heads or topics, thus breaking the chronological series, so as to take the reader again and again over the same ground, and making it almost impossible to know whereabouts, in the stream of time, the author is hurrying him. We have no patience with biographies which give us first the private character, then the ministerial character, then the learning, then the eloquence, of their subject, in as many different partitions; and we are not quite sure that, in the abstract which follows, we shall in all cases be able to extricate the thread of the story from this incorrigible tangle.*

The time at which Calvin returned to Geneva, to commence the foundation of his more important structure, was one of great interest in the affairs of the world. The threatening approaches of the Turks under Soliman filled with terror the people of eastern Europe. The Emperor Charles the Fifth, meditating the greatest enterprises, was now in Italy; full of projects for the conquest of Algiers, and the humiliation of the Sultan: the signal disappointment of these plans is well known. In Germany, the Protestants were in correspondence with England and France, and the perfidious Francis I. was feeding their hopes with promises, and at the same time allowing his kingdom to be the theatre of grievous persecutions.

The first efforts of Calvin, upon his restoration, were directed towards the establishment of pure teaching, and the reformation of morals. In the pursuance of the latter object

* The portrait of Calvin, which was promised for this volume, has been delayed for a reason which is highly pleasing. Since it was in hand, the interesting intelligence has been received that there exists in the gallery of the duke of Bevilacqua at Naples, an original portrait of Calvin by Titian, which was painted in the year 1535, at Modena. A copy of this youthful likeness, invaluable as well in regard of the master as the subject, will appear in the third volume.

he was actuated by the most sincere zeal for the glory of God, yet the means which he used were such as seem to us to conflict in many instances with the principles of religious liberty and ecclesiastical independence, which have since become almost universal, especially in our own country. In a state of public morals so abandoned as that of Geneva, it was natural to think of strong measures; it was indispensable that strong measures should be employed; but it would have been less hazardous to consign the conduct of these to the civil rather than the ecclesiastical power. In our day this would be *done*, as a matter of course; but in that period the minds of good people were filled with the idea of the ancient Theocracy, and this proved the source of many inconveniences. "The church," says M. Henry, "was intimately woven with the state; the state protected the church which was subject to it, and the church in turn ruled over the state, as all citizens were under the superintendence of the consistory."

The return of Calvin was welcomed by the people with enthusiasm. The whole city was moved at his coming. It appears, from the municipal records, that a mounted herald was sent to meet him at Strasburg. It was resolved to send for his wife, and for his household furniture. They furnished his house, and appropriated eight dollars 'pour la robe de Maistre Calvin, minister evangelique.' St. Peter's church was fitted up for preaching, the pulpit being so disposed that the speaker might be near the people. Antiquaries persuade themselves that they find the dwelling of Calvin in the *rue des chanoines*, in the highest part of the town. It was conveniently near to the Convent of St. Peter's, where the consistorial meetings were held, and to the old Gothic church where he preached and lectured. A neighbouring spot afforded an open prospect of the fortifications, and of Mount Jura, and other summits.

The field was now open for Calvin's disciplinary measures. The populace of Geneva, it should seem from the accounts, was devoted to dancing and the like sports and pastimes, and to every form of license and voluptuousness. It was now ordered that they should resort to public worship, at stated times during the week. The city was divided into three parishes, St. Peter's, la Madelaine, and St. Gervais'. The first and last of these were under the care of Calvin and Viret. St. Peter's was for the higher class, and St. Gervais' for the common people. Laws were now enacted against all

prevalent vices, and a vigilant care was exercised over the manners of the whole city.

Another favourite object of the Reformer was the perfection of schools. He brought to Geneva the classical Castellio, and Maturin Cordier, or Corderius, whom we have already mentioned. In the very beginning of the Reformation a school had been set up by Farel, but this had been neglected. Numbers of learned men were subsequently collected. The care of these things withdrew Calvin in some measure from his expository writings, but he returned to them afterwards with new animation. His time was greatly occupied: "Besides my ordinary business," says he, "I have to write so many letters and answers to inquiries, that many a night passes without having brought to nature the offering of sleep."

In 1542 Farel was at Metz, engaged in his usual daring measures. He determined to preach upon a certain Sunday in the month of September, and chose as the place the churchyard of the Dominicans, in which there was a pulpit. The number of hearers was very great. During the sermon there came two Dominican friars who commanded him to be silent. This had no effect, and the Dominicans began to ring all their bells, but Farel made such use of his Stentorian voice that the interruption was of no avail. They succeeded, however, in ejecting him from the consecrated pulpit. Next came a public disputation between Farel and a Franciscan monk. Farel maintained that the participation of the body of Christ was spiritual: there was an audience of three thousand persons. Farel was dragged before the magistrates, and was asked by whose authority he preached: he answered, that Christ had commanded it, and his people had desired it. The Protestants found a man who greatly resembled Farel, and by conducting this person out of the city on horse-back, appeased the mob. The missionary however remained at Metz. In consequence of these proceedings Calvin repaired to that city, and was absent from home about six weeks.

Amidst these things a new champion for the truth appeared among the Reformed: "There is a man come out of Italy," writes Bucer, "very learned in Greek, Latin and Hebrew, and delightfully versed in the Holy Scriptures; forty-four years old, of a serious mind, and discriminating judgment. He has been one of the regular canons at Lucca. His name is Peter Martyr." This is the man who was afterwards much celebrated at Zurich and Oxford; a theologian whom

Calvin loved and valued, calling him the wonder of Italy.

In 1542 Geneva was visited by the plague. All the country around was desolated by pestilence and dearth. The dread of this disease, usually held to be contagious, was extreme. Even of pious persons the great majority shrank from all intercourse with the sick. Castellio, Blanchet and Calvin offered themselves as chaplains at the plague-hospital. They cast lots, and the lot fell upon Castellio, who thereupon changed his mind and drew back. Calvin held himself ready, but this was prevented by the council and by Blanchet himself, upon whom the duty finally devolved. About ten months after this good man fell a victim to the disorder. The plague raged at intervals during three or four years. After the death of Blanchet, it was expressly ordered that Calvin should not go to the hospital, 'as the church had need of him.' In 1543 its prevalence was such that the courts of justice were closed.

It is somewhat difficult to ascertain the precise relation which Calvin during this period held to the authorities of the city. He was the object of conflicting opinions. His talents and piety commanded respect, and his counsel was sought with avidity, while at the same time we find that he was suspected, and that his books were submitted to a censorship which he regarded as highly offensive. Nevertheless, he received many tokens of respect. He was allowed to have a herald when he travelled, and when he was sick a secretary was furnished at public expense. Those who have called this reformer the Pope of Geneva may be answered in the words of M. Henry, that the forms of the republic and the presbyterial organization of the church were alike incompatible with that despotic sway which has been ascribed to him. It cannot but happen, however, as Bretschneider has said, that men of such strength of character and of such exalted genius should govern the minds which come into contact with them. "As to the power which makes me the object of envy," said Calvin himself, "I wish it were in my power to transfer it to them, for they see a kingdom in the multitude of affairs, and the oppressive burden which I have to bear." And he appeals to his brethren as having never complained of any usurpations on his part.

It is not intended here to represent Calvin as having held himself aloof from the civil regulations of the little republic. On the contrary he was undeniably the life and soul of these. Such was his ideal of a true Christian state, in which the

civil and ecclesiastical power should go hand in hand to carry out the principles of God's word, that he used all his influence to render the constitution of the city as pure as human arrangements can be made. It was his principle, that sins against God, no less than sins against man, should be punished. The authorities therefore animadverted upon profaneness, sabbath-breaking, incontinence, blasphemy, heresy, and witchcraft. It is entertaining to find copies from Calvin's own manuscript respecting some of the minutest points, and, as we should say, the most out of his line; such as, provision against fire—inspection of buildings—the artillery—and the forms of civil process.

Where it was possible, all remains of the old superstition were annulled. The preacher had a watchful eye over the families, examined them on the faith, and inquired into their fitness for the sacraments and their attendance upon them. No one was allowed to lie sick more than three days without informing the minister of his quarter. Sermons were frequent, and attendance was enforced. In later days, but in pursuance of the same system, we find that divine service was solemnized in the garrison twice every day; a laudable custom which continued until the prevalence of the new divinity. At every gate of the city, in front of the guard-house, a soldier knelt down before the opening of the gates, and offered a prayer with a loud voice. All profane and abusive language was forbidden. Galiffe sneeringly relates, that while the preachers employed all sorts of vituperation, the consistorial court enjoined that the peasants should speak politely to their oxen, and that a fellow was dealt with because he had let slip an oath at his beast. Parental authority was enforced by the severest penalties. In 1566 a peasant's child, who had called her mother a devil, *diabliesse*, was openly scourged, and suspended by the arms from a gibbet, to shew that she was deserving of death. All games of chance and boisterous amusements were visited in like manner. The ancient laws against heresy and witchcraft retained their force. In the course of sixty years, the registers show that 150 persons were burnt for witchcraft in this little city: nor was this infatuation brought to a close until the end of the seventeenth century. M. Henry sees reason to believe that these regulations are indicative of a period in which the mind of Calvin had not yet gained complete mastery over the traditionary spirit, and that at a later time we discern a milder and more consistent code.

M. Henry devotes a chapter to the exposition of Calvin's theory of church government: this however is a subject so familiar to our thoughts, and so much more clearly laid open in the original works, that the accounts of the biographer need not detain us. The Catechisms of Calvin have been celebrated. The first of these appeared in 1536 in French, and in 1538 in Latin: it was an epitome of his Institutes. His Catechism for children, more familiar to us under that name, was first published in 1541, and acquired great notoriety as a church-symbol. It is painful to observe the desuetude into which this work has fallen. In some churches it has given place to that of Osterwald: in Geneva it has been superseded by that of Vernet, a rationalist. "And surely," says M. Henry, "it is among the follies of our age, that it busies itself with innumerable attempts to construct a new popular catechism, which can never succeed, because the best in this kind is already extant, and the new in comparison appears unsatisfactory, colourless, and superficial." The fundamental idea in this, as in the other works of Calvin, is living faith in God: to this every thing is referred. The beginning therefore is not made, as in Luther's, from the exposition of the law, but the 'true knowledge of God,' and confidence in him.

On the subject of creeds and confessions M. Henry gives the following statements. "When Calvin entered into his church he found some formularies already in existence; as, the confession of Zuinglius to Charles V., which had no symbolical force; the *Confessio tetrapolitana*, and the two Helvetic confessions, which had acquired a high authority. The first Helvetic Confession is that of Mühlhausen, by Oswald Myconius; the second is that of 1536, which was the work of Bullinger, Myconius, and Grynaeus, and of which Ruchat says: "C'est celle que nous appelons première Helvétique, pour la distinguer d'une autre plus étendue faite l'an 1566." But altogether there were four Confessions of Faith in the reformed churches: First, that which was set forth at Geneva, by Farel, with Calvin, in twenty-one articles, to which the citizens were caused to swear in 1536, but which had no symbolical force. Secondly, the Third Helvetic Confession, of 1566, which was occasioned by the resolutions of the *Consensus Tigurinus* of the years 1549, 1551, 1554. This is the earlier one of 1536, entirely new-wrought by Bullinger, Beza, and Gualter; it was subscribed by all the Swiss churches, except Basle and Neuchatel, and

is consequently the confession of the Genevan churches. Thirdly, The French Confession, the origin of which is related in Beza's church history, and Crespin's history of the Martyrs. The earliest church existed as early as 1555. Under Henry II. the assembled parliament declared itself almost with one voice for the new doctrine; many members of parliament were imprisoned; but in 1559 when the Reformed for the first time met in a national synod, they set forth the discipline, as well as the confession of their faith, in forty articles.* It is this which, in 1561, was laid before Charles IX. and Catharine de Medicis, at Poissy, and became the symbolical book of the old French Reformed Church. Fourthly, we find a well-considered confession, which Calvin wrote in 1562 for the Reformed churches, addressed to the Emperor of Germany and the Prince of Condé at Frankfort, but which remained without symbolical authority."

Psalmody was a darling object with the Reformers. All the world knows what Luther did in this matter. The French churches were not without like efforts. Calvin introduced the singing of psalms into divine service as soon as it was practicable, but he seems to have discountenanced the use of the organ. The French poet Marot versified fifty psalms, and the remainder was done by Beza, under Calvin's direction. It appears from the registers, that a singing-master was employed to teach the children an hour a day. This old translation is remarkable for its inimitable naïveté and deep feeling, and the melodies which were composed, or harmonized, at the time, by Goudimel, partake of the same character, and are still used. This musician fell a victim to the St. Bartholomew's massacre, at Lyons, together with thirteen other Huguenots.† The effects produced by this psalmody are characteristic of the French people. The psalms were sung by the king and his courtiers; each one making choice of a favourite one. Henry II. made a hunting-song of the forty-second psalm. Madame de Valentinois used to sing the 130th when she danced. The Queen

* On dressa Confession de foi, à laquelle toutes les Eglises se tiendroient. Beza hist. eccl. L. 2. p. 173, 185.

† Thuanus I. 52. p. 1084: *Honesti cives e carcere educti ac sicis jugulati in Rhodanum projiciuntur; eandem fortunam expertus est Claudius Gaudimelus excellens nostra ætate musicus, qui psalmos Davidicos vernaculis versibus a Clemente Maroto et Theodoro Beza expressos ad varios et jucundissimos modulationum numeros aptavit, quibus et hodie publice in concionibus Protestantium ac privatim decantantur.*

selected the 6th; the king of Navarre the 43d. Many of the tunes to which these were sung were the most popular airs of the day. In Paris they were sung by great crowds in the public streets, were received with enthusiasm by the people, and produced effects such as have seldom followed any religious music of modern times. If space were allowed us, we could easily fill several pages in giving the details of this influence.*

We are sorry to be under the necessity of expressing our strong dissent from some of the opinions of M. Henry in regard to the supposed extremes to which Calvin pushed his reformation of divine service. Though we cannot go out of our way to argue the point, we may say, that what the biographer suggests concerning the monastic life, the use of the cross, auricular confession, and the multiplication of festivals, is as really superstitious, as it is inconsistent with the whole tenour of this excellent book; and we cannot conceal the surprise with which we have been affected by it.

It is with other sentiments that we turn to the consideration of Calvin's personal and ministerial temper and habits. This is a point upon which our clerical readers will naturally feel an interest, and M. Henry has here taken great pains, and availed himself of resources hitherto unexplored. Our only difficulty in treating of it arises from the singular dislocation of facts, which is demanded by M. Henry's rage for classification, to which we have already adverted. If one were to confine his view to the works of Calvin, he might readily suppose that he was a mere recluse theologian. Nothing could be further from the truth. His life, and even his writings, had throughout a practical tendency; and while he lived he was perhaps more influential by his personal exertions than by his books. In the minutest affairs of the household, we find him as zealous and exact as in the confutation of heresy; or the exposition of Scripture.

The literary labours of Calvin, like those of Luther and Melancthon, were amazing. The ages of these three men may be stated at an average of fifty-nine years, yet each of them, as our biographer observes, left ten volumes of masterpieces. Who can calculate the labour which they cost! All three were professors, and two of them pastors. Calvin lived long in a short life. He was a man of little

* Many of these, both music and words, may be found in the exquisite little selection used in the Evangelical Churches, under the title, *Chants Chrétiens*. Paris, 1834. 12mo. pp. 368

sleep, as he says, *somni paene nullius*, and little given to indulgence. He speaks of days in which besides preaching and lecturing, he had corrected twenty sheets, and attended to public business. He always took part in the consistorial affairs, the clerical association and the 'congregation' or popular conference. Three days in the week he lectured on theology, and every other week he preached daily. The tradition is that in the multiplicity of his avocations, he never forgot any thing that belonged to his office; and his memory enabled him, as Beza records, to return to a piece of writing, and take up his pen where he had laid it down, without even looking at what preceded. Like many other great men, he had a remarkable faculty of recognising any countenance which he had ever seen. His correspondence was immense: the care of all the reformed churches came upon him daily. Besides this he translated most of his own works. Musculus compared him to a bow which was always bent. He prepared and sent out preachers, and used to say 'Give us the wood, and we will give you the arrows.'* The council also gave him much to do, and he had to spend a good portion of his time in journeys for some public object. He was never happier than when fully employed in some great work. During the pestilence he was indefatigable; in the dread of the siege in 1559, he worked with his own hands at the fortifications. Yet he sometimes bewailed his inefficiency, and on his death-bed craved the pardon of the council for having done no more. This tension of mind was kept up in spite of a condition of body which would exempt most men from all labours; and it lasted as long as his life. For many years he was afflicted with asthma, vertigo, gout, and stone, besides other less insupportable maladies.

It is almost superfluous to state that the style of Calvin is celebrated. From nature and from fixed principle he allowed his thoughts to fall into short, pithy, sententious periods: consequently his oral discourses required close attention. His Latin style evinces great familiarity with the classics: he excelled in this, more than in his mother-tongue. In freedom and grace he was however surpassed by Melancthon. His writings show great clearness of thought, exact discrimination, and a repugnance to parade and verbiage. There is scarcely a quaint turn or a superflu-

* Cet excellent serviteur de Dieu, M. Calvin, qui vivoit alors, avoit accoutumé de répondre à ceux qui lui demandoient des pasteurs: "Envoyez nous du bois, nous vous enverrons des flèches."

ous epithet in all his volumes. Pungent sarcasm, and overwhelming invective abound: these however are always despatched at once; falling like lightning.* Beza says of his manner of composition, *Tot verba, tot pondera*. He further ascribes much of his exactness and conciseness to the custom of dictating, and says that he wrote almost exactly as he spoke. Melancthon expressed admiration of his nervous eloquence;† and Salmasius solemnly declared that he should have gained more fame by being the author of the Institutes alone, than from all the works of Grotius. The Dedication to Francis I. has been frequently cited as one of the noblest compositions of its kind.

As a preacher Calvin was expository. In no instance does he seem to have aimed at oratorical pomp. As compared with Luther, he is less idiomatic and racy in his diction, less illustrative and humorous, less strong in single strokes, but equally addicted to apothegmatic forms, and vastly more ratiocinative and connected. In every discourse, one sees through from the beginning to the end.

Calvin preached extempore: there is no trace of his having written a sermon before delivery. Indeed he says himself, in a letter now for the first time published, that his discourses on the eighth psalm were taken down from his lips.‡ In writing to the lord protector Somerset, he speaks thus: "The people must be so instructed as to be touched to the quick, and feel, as the apostle says, that the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, even to the marrow of the bones. I say this, my lord, because it seems to me that their is very little lively preaching in your kingdom, but that the most recite it, in the reading way. I see very well the necessities which constrain you to this; for, in the first place, you have not, I suppose, as many good pastors as you desire. And then, there is danger lest certain volatile spirits should overleap all bounds, and disseminate idle fancies, as is often the case with novelties. But all these considerations do not hinder the duty of giving free course to the ordinance of Christ re-

* See his own observations on his manner of writing. Instit. l. iii. c. 6. §. i.

† Nullius hoc tempore oratio in disputando vel nervosior fuit, vel splendidior.

‡ Je n'ai point écrit en chambre les vingt-deux sermons sur le pseume octonaire, mais on les a imprimés naïvement, comme on les avoit pu recueillir de ma bouche au temple. Là vous voyez notre style et façon ordinaire d'enseigner.

specting the preaching of the gospel. Now this preaching ought not to be dead but living, in order to instruct, to exhort, to correct, as St. Paul says in 2 Tim. iii. 16."

The four sermons of Calvin against the Nicodemites are rather long. Those on the book of Job, in number one hundred and fifty, are quite short. The former may have been forty-five minutes, the latter half an hour. His practical discourses on the minor prophets and the epistles are still shorter. In this we think him wiser than many of his successors; for we hear few long sermons which are not made so by the preacher's spinning out "the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument." Weariness is a foe to edification, especially where, as is common, the speaker fills his hour by saying every thing twice over. Mathesius once asked Luther how he should regulate the length of his sermons: "When you see," said Luther, "that the people are listening with great earnestness and avidity—stop just there—the next time they will come with more willingness."

Scaliger, who had heard Calvin preach, says that he spoke slowly, in consequence of the asthma, and that it was therefore easy to take down almost every word. There was a man at Geneva who made a living by reporting his sermons. The city registers contain statements of prodigious multitudes that attended his preaching. The discourses on Job were commonly read throughout France in places where there were no preachers; yet, as Beza tells us, they were printed against his wishes. There are preserved at Geneva, in forty-four volumes, two thousand and twenty-three manuscript sermons of Calvin; of these some have been published. He never wrote out any of his theological lectures for the press. Many of them were published in the same way as his sermons. It is matter of regret that we have no reports of the fiery discourses which he pronounced at Paris in the days of his youthful daring, every one of which used to end with the words, 'If God be for us, who can be against us!'

The merit of all Calvin's compositions resides so much in the structure, the connexion, the *ensemble*, that to offer a specimen is to show a brick as a sample of a building. There are a few separable passages which may be seen in the appendix to this volume.*

* Some of these are striking. In speaking of the covetousness of rich masters, he says: "The wages of those who have laboured for our profit, and which is kept back by fraud, will send a cry up to heaven, and will make all

It is natural in this connexion to allude to Calvin's diligence and faithfulness in making provision for the pastoral care. His love for souls breathes from the little prayers introductory to his lectures on Job, which would, if collected, form an edifying manual. He often speaks of a solicitude for the salvation of his flock, such as filled him with anguish—of his accountability for every individual—and of the peril of having the blood of souls on his garments. Among his labours in this field, we find these following. Every Friday there was a meeting of the congregation for the exposition of Scripture. On this he laid great stress. At this were delivered certain discourses on Providence, Predestination, and the Lord's Prayer, which are extant. At these meetings any one who chose might debate any point with the preacher. Calvin always encouraged this open participation of the people in the conference; and on the same principle he caused the children to be catechized in the presence of the whole congregation.

Another excellent institution was the stated visitation of the sick, to which Calvin allotted a special article in his liturgy, *de la visitation des malades*. In this it is declared that "it is the duty of the preacher not only to preach the truth, but so far as is possible, to warn, encourage, and comfort every individual." And particular directions are given as to the way of discharging this duty to the sick. As it regards the Lord's Supper, Calvin was in favour of having it administered at least once a month. As soon as the way was clear for such a measure, he established stated family visitation, with strict examination into the spiritual state of every inmate, the servants not excepted. M. Henry declares that this practice is utterly unknown in the Reformed Churches of the Continent; and there are signs of its going into disuse in parts of America. In order to keep up the interest of the hearers, Calvin took measures for a rotation of services in the different churches.

From the voluminous correspondence of the Reformer, M. Henry has given a number of characteristic extracts. Many

creatures bear witness of our violence and extortion towards our neighbours. Thus the prophet Habakkuk says, that the walls of the houses which have been built by fraud and rapine will cry out loud and clear; the cry will echo and re-echo, answering from side to side. One will say, here is blood! another, here is murder! another, here is fraud! Here is cruelty! Here is plunder! Here is avarice! Here is theft! Here is malice! Here is perjury! Let us therefore take good heed, that as we have abused the creatures of God, he will cause that at the last day they shall cry out for vengeance against us."

of these are addressed to persons labouring under strong temptations to despondency; and we observe the same in the correspondence of Luther. Others, and these are among the most remarkable, were written to imprisoned Christians, sometimes on the eve of martyrdom. These are full of heroic sentiments, and of faith and courage like that of primitive times. To some brethren at Aix, who asked whether it was right to repel force by force, he wrote: "It is the dictate of the higher Christian wisdom, that we abide by the rule which our divine Master has laid down, namely, to possess our souls in patience. And indeed our only sure resort, is to seek shelter under his shadow from heat and tempest and every necessity. But as soon as we repel force with force, we put his hand and help far from us. Hence the apostle admonishes us to leave vengeance to God alone, and to rely on his promise, that he will guard his people against the rage of the ungodly. The blood of the pious cries from earth to heaven, and is the seed of the church." So also, as to the question whether one might use false keys, or bribes, in order to escape from prison: "I would neither advise nor countenance any thing of the kind. Yet, if it actually occur, I would accompany it with my prayers, and heartily rejoice, if any one, without offence to the good, regain his liberty." He was almost overwhelmed with the greatness of his epistolary commerce; and there is scarcely a point of casuistry in which his judgment was not asked and received.

The period including 1542 and 1549 was fraught with great events. During these eight years the activity of Calvin with regard to the general interests of Protestantism was tasked to the utmost; and he was called upon to protect the church against a diversity of enemies—in the empire—in the Romish Church—in the intolerant portion of Lutheranism—in the Pelagian party—and in the bosom of the Reformed communion. Two great events made this season critical, the Council of Trent and the death of Luther. The writings of Calvin in these emergencies were numerous. He addressed himself to the Princes at Spire; he armed himself against the Tridentine decrees, and the Interim, and stood upon the defence of the doctrines of Grace; and this over and above the preparation of a goodly number of exegetical works.

In 1542 the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne issued twenty-five new articles of faith, in opposition to Protestant heresies. Calvin replied to these, and exposed the ignorance and stupidity of the papists with an irresistible wit much like

what was afterwards employed in the same cause by Pascal.* The whole is an ironical apology for the papistical errors. We would gladly cite some of M. Henry's exquisite specimens of this triumphant raillery.

He was soon called forth against a higher adversary, no less a personage than his holiness Paul the Third. This ambitious and voluptuous pontiff was not more remarkable for his imperious ecclesiastical demands, than for the infamy of his son and grandson, Pietro and Octavio Farnese. Paul was so much dissatisfied with the attempts made by the emperor at the Diet of Spire, in 1544, towards pacification, that he wrote him a letter of mingled admonition and threatening, in which he held up for his alarm all the instances in which Providence had signally punished those Princes who were disobedient to the Holy See. The occasion was felicitous, and Calvin immediately came forward with strictures on the Pope's letter;† these may, in point of boldness and energy, be put by the side of any of Luther's. It was no ordinary courage which could beard the lion in such terms as these:

“If this example of the judgment of God upon Eli alarms the Holy Father so much, one may well wonder, that troubled about the alleged fault of the emperor, he yet sinks into the deepest slumber when it comes to the faults of his own sons. God punished the remissness of Eli, in that he did not chastise his children. But the apostle Paul enjoins that the children of the Christian bishop should be penetrated with good morals and the fear of God. Now our pope Paul Farnese has a son, and this son has children, besides other bastards; and nevertheless this old man, with one foot in the grave—a mere mass of corruption—persists in his iniquities.‡ Who is Pietro Luigi? I will tell what is portentous, and yet no more than the bare truth. Italy has never produced such an abomination—and wherefore do you slumber over this, O Pope? while the scandalous whoredoms of your son have reached up to heaven, while the whole earth is full of their stench, and the whole world cries out against them. Is not here the occasion for your Holiness to exercise severity?

* In Latin: *Antidoton adversus Articulos Facultatis Theologiae Sorbonicae*. The French title was: *Les Articles de la sacrée faculté de Theol. de Paris concernant notre foi et religion chrétienne et forme de precher. Avec le remède contre la poison*. 1543.

† Scholia in epist. Pauli III. pontif. max.

‡ We give the more pregnant original: *Et outre ce, il a des bastards, et ce viellard qui est sur le borde de la fosse, et ceste charongue à demi pourrie, fait encore des enfans!*

What shall I say of his avarice, of his ravenous cupidity, of his inhumanity? in which he has outstripped all mankind—his father only excepted! If Eli was punished for undue lenity, shall Pope Paul go free, who shuts mouth and eyes, and gives his hand and approbation to such wickedness? O infamous Pope, doth not the judgment of God fill thee with anguish!" The Pope had quoted the apostle's maxim, *Evil communications corrupt good manners*. "O thou godless apostate!" exclaims Calvin, "what hast thou that agrees with these words? Thou, who art the ringleader and captain in all denial of God—thou, who spendest whole days in forging treasons, wars, plots, fresh rapine, and ruin of the innocent—who destroyest religion with the worst counsels—and who spendest the rest of thy time in pleasure with thine epicurean friends, . . . or in the midst of thy concubines."

This was immediately followed by the letter, which Calvin addressed to the Emperor, then at Spire; and of which Beza says: *haud scio an ullum nervosius et gravius ejus argumenti scriptum nostro saeculo editum fuerit*. It was the object of this production to conciliate the Emperor in behalf of the Reformation.

About the same time, namely, in 1543, Calvin felt it to be his duty to enter the field against what M. Henry calls 'the fundamental error of the world,'—Pelagianism. We direct attention to this with the more earnestness, because it is a part of the policy of errorists in our own day, to keep out of view the fact that much of the warfare of Protestant Reformers was against the Pelagianism of the Papists. A certain Pighius of Kempen had appeared in opposition to the doctrines of grace, and the controversy which followed was much like that between Erasmus and Luther.† Calvin and Pighius, says our author, were preparing the very controversy which afterwards agitated the Synod of Dort. The Reformers were unanimous upon this topic. Calvin tells his opponent, not to wonder at the mighty spread of their doctrine, for, "it is not Luther who has spoken, but God who has thundered and lightened by his lips." M. Henry confirms the statement of all sound historians as to the entire coincidence of Luther and Calvin upon the doctrines of election

* Supplex exhortatio ad invictissimum Caesarem Carolum Quintum et illustrissimos principes aliosque ordines Spirae nunc Imperii conventum agentes, ut restituendae ecclesiae curam serio velint suscipere, 1544.

† J. Calvini Defensio sacrae et orthodoxae doctrinae de servitute et liberatione humani arbitrii adversus calumnias Alb. Pighii. Genev. 1543.

and predestination. In the analysis of this work, into which M. Henry goes very fully, we cannot follow him. The book made a deep impression. Melancthon, to whom it was dedicated, received it at Cologne, where he was with Bucer. He wrote a letter in which he hails and encourages this younger coadjutor, declaring that the latter had written with piety and eloquence—*non solum pie, sed etiam eloquenter*. He cheers him on in his course of polemical authorship, and asks: "Who, in our day, is master of a style either more nervous or more eloquent?"

Calvin was the first to come forth against the decrees of the Council of Trent.* His work is learned and profound, going thoroughly into the differences between the two churches. It was answered by John Cochlaeus. After setting aside the authority of Council, in general, and of this in particular, he proceeds to canvass the specific points. It is a triumph of wit and dialectics. Among other things, he fixes upon the Tridentine fathers the charge of repelling Pelagianism with the left hand, while they welcome it with the right.

During this period the name of *Nicodemites* was given to those faint-hearted persons, who were convinced of the errors of Popery, but were afraid to avow it, and excused themselves in assisting at the Catholic rites. Among these were found many persons of quality, who were altogether unable to stand erect in the storm of persecution which raged in and after the year 1545. Such weakness, at a time when multitudes were going to martyrdom, filled Calvin with indignation: hence his two works *against the Nicodemites*.† These were by some considered severe, but they were useful in arming many for the mortal conflict, not only in France and Switzerland, but in Germany also. It was such sentiments as those expressed in his tracts, and a hundred times in his private letters, which produced decisions like that of the Waldensian believer, who being left to choose between kissing the cross or being cast headlong from a tower, chose the latter without one moment of tremor or hesitation. "What would have become of the church," exclaims Calvin, "if early Christians had done as we do? The whole theology of the ancient martyrs consisted in knowing that there is

* Acta synodi Tridentinae, cum antidoto. 1547.

† 1. De vitandis superstitionibus. 2. Excusatio ad Pseudo-Nicodemitas, cum duabus epistolis ad ministros ecclesiae Tigurinae.

only one God, to whom we must pray, and in whom we must put all our trust, and that there is no salvation out of Jesus Christ. They had no such knowledge of these things as that they could learnedly explain them, but maintained them in all simplicity. Nevertheless they threw themselves with joyful hearts into the fire; yea, women even yielded up their own children. But we—who are great doctors—know not what it is to bear witness to the truth.” Upon the subject of these writings, there appeared opinions from Melancthon, Bucer, and Peter Martyr, who all agreed with Calvin.

As only a single letter seems to have been written by Calvin to Luther, we should think ourselves inexcusable if we omitted it here. Its date is January 20th, 1545; and after a respectable salutation it proceeds as follows:

“When I have seen such of our Frenchmen as have been brought from popish darkness to soundness of faith, still making no change in their public profession, and continuing to pollute themselves with the sacrileges of the Papists, as if they had never tasted true doctrine, I have been unable to refrain from rebuking such remissness with the severity which I think it deserves. For what sort of faith is that which lies buried in the mind, and never breaks forth into a confession? What sort of religion is that which lies plunged in a pretence of idolatry? But I do not here take up this topic, which I have largely handled in two books, wherein, if it be not too much trouble to cast your eye over them, you will better see what are my opinions, and my reasons for them. By the reading of these, some of our people have been awakened, who were before at ease in deep sleep, and have begun to think what they ought to do. But as it is hard for one so far to forget self as to jeopard life, or stirring up obloquy to invite the hatred of the world, or abandoning fortune and natal soil to go into voluntary exile, they are restrained by these difficulties from coming to any certain resolution. They allege, however, other and quite specious reasons, but such as show that they are merely seeking for a pretext. But as they hesitate in a sort of suspense, they desire to hear your judgment, which, as they justly revere it, will have the effect of greatly confirming them. They have, therefore, besought me to send to you express a sure messenger who may bring back your answer upon this matter. This their request I was not willing to refuse, both because I supposed it would be greatly to their advantage to be aided by your authority, so as to be relieved from per-

petual fluctuation, and because I wished the same support for myself. Now, therefore, most revered father in the Lord, I conjure you in the name of Christ, that for my sake and theirs, you will take the trouble first of reading the epistle written in their name, and then of running over carelessly at some leisure hour my little books, or at least that you would commit the reading of them to some one who may report to you their contents; further that you would briefly write your opinion. It is with reluctance that I give you this trouble in the midst of so many and so great occupations, but I am persuaded, as I do this from necessity, your usual equity, will pardon me. O that I could fly to you, and enjoy your conversation, at least for a few hours! This I would greatly prefer, and it would be much better to confer with you face to face, not only concerning this question, but other matters also: but this favour, not granted here on earth, will shortly, I hope, be enjoyed in heaven. Farewell, most illustrious man, most excellent minister of Christ, and my ever honoured father! The Lord continue to guide you by his Spirit to the end, for the common good of his church!"

This letter was accompanied by another, addressed to Melancthon; the object of which was to urge the latter to use every means of keeping the mind of Luther from being embittered, of which there was the greatest danger in consequence of the Sacramentarian controversy. Both Calvin and Melancthon manifested the strongest desire to avoid even the appearance of dissension in doctrine. But the latter years of Luther were marked by excessive irascibility on every point connected with what he thought the Zuinglian heresy. The reply of Melancthon was characteristic. "I have not shown your letter," says he, "to Doctor Martin: for he looks on many things with suspicion, and is unwilling that his opinions on such questions as those which you propose, should be circulated."

The latter years of Luther's life were frequently embittered by his morbid and excessive zeal in the Sacramentarian controversy. A word or two concerning the origin of this may not be unnecessary. Zuinglius maintained, as is well known, that the body of Christ was not present with the elements in the Eucharist. Luther held the contrary opinion, and, in 1526, entered the lists against Zuinglius. A year later Zuinglius published a treatise which was very decided, but highly respectful towards his venerable opponent. Luther rejoined, charging the origin of the dispute upon the other,

and declaring that the question was of such moment, that one or the other party must be God's enemy. Next appeared another publication on the Swiss side, and then their great Confession. In 1529, Philip of Hesse caused a conference to be held at Marburg, in which both sides claimed the victory. By degrees the controversy was relaxed, particularly after the death of Zuinglius and Oecolampadius, in 1531; their disciples were satisfied with propagating their doctrines. In 1536, chiefly through the instrumentality of Bucer, the Wittenberg Conference took place. But in the last years of his life, Luther showed a disposition to renew the conflict, even if he should be left alone upon the field. In 1543 he wrote to Froschauer, that neither he nor any church of Christ could hold fellowship with the Swiss. Melancthon sought in vain to soften him. In 1545, he published, in his Annotations on Genesis, and in other forms, the most bitter expressions against the Reformed, denominating Zuinglius, Oecolampadius and their adherents, 'Enemies of the Sacrament,' 'Heretics,' and 'Reprobates.' Long ago, he declares, he had ceased to pray for men who were murderers of souls — '*Seelfresser und Seelmörder.*' The Swiss answered these assaults by the hands of Bullinger, but the book did not meet the views of Calvin. "If the matter stands," he writes to Melancthon, "as the men of Zurich say, they have had just cause to write. But they should either write otherwise or not at all. For not to say that the whole tract is jejune and puerile, that in many things they excuse and sustain Zuinglius with more pertinacity than learning, and with too little modesty, and that they censure certain things in Luther unjustly, in my opinion they handle the main matter in dispute very unhappily." The feelings of Luther towards the Zuinglians were unchanged. After his death there were found in a letter of date January 17, 1546, these words: *Beatus vir, qui non abiit in consilio Sacramentariorum, nec stetit in via Cinglianorum, nec sedet in cathedra Tigurinorum.*

Many of the writings of Calvin show how greatly he was concerned in this controversy. His endeavours were almost all towards conciliation. In 1544, we find him beseeching Bullinger to treat the aged Reformer with forbearance. "I have often said," Calvin writes, "that if Luther were to call me a devil, I should nevertheless continue reverently to regard him as an extraordinary servant of God, who certainly, as he is endowed with remarkable virtues, has also some great faults. Would to God, that he had taken more pains

to get the mastery of that tempestuous passion, which is perpetually bursting forth!" He also endeavoured to animate Melancthon, whose mild and almost cowardly temper was overborne by his great patron. The words of Calvin are notable: "In truth," says he, "we set a poor example to posterity, if we chose to surrender all our liberty, rather than to offend one individual. Truly his spirit is imperious, and often knows no bounds. Yet this must continually go further, if all give up to him, and yield him every thing. If in the newly awakened church such an example of tyranny finds place, what may we expect, when affairs shall have taken a more unfavourable turn?" He then proceeds to administer to Melancthon a most penetrating rebuke for his want of courage in not avowing his convictions upon this point.

The triumphant progress of the Emperor in 1547 filled the hearts of all Protestants with alarm. The elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse were both made prisoners, and were led about as captives. Calvin was called to see his dearest friends, Melancthon, Bucer, and Peter Martyr, exposed to the imminent vengeance of the persecutors. The league of Smalkalde was dissolved, and a diet was called at Augsburg. Here a number of the protestant princes were overawed, and there was every appearance that the work of reformation, at least in Germany, was rapidly approaching its close. Many refugees were received in Geneva, and much of Calvin's time was employed in writing for the comfort and corroboration of those brethren who were under persecution. But his principal effort was directed against the grand expedient of the emperor, namely the *Formula ad Interim*, which was issued in 1548. This was a scheme of doctrine, set forth as a basis of pacification, until the decision of a general council. In this formula, the doctrine of justification by faith alone was denied, and almost every popish error was asserted; but it left the Protestants in the enjoyment of the eucharist in both kinds, and freed their clergy from the obligation of celibacy. The emperor had made it a capital offence to write against the Interim; yet it was answered in no less than thirty-seven publications. Among these not the least remarkable was that of Calvin, which appeared in 1549. It closes with a spirited exhortation to all evangelical Christians, to hold themselves ready to die for the truth. At a later period, when Melancthon seemed to vacillate, and yielded to the terms of the modified

Leipsick Interim, he was thus addressed by Calvin: "In such a man, vacillation is not to be endured. A hundred times rather would I die with thee, than see thee survive a doctrine which thou hadst betrayed."

Many of the protestants, after the destruction of their hopes in Germany, fled to England, where they contributed not a little to the establishment of the truth. The most remarkable among these exiles were Peter Martyr, Bucer, Fagius, and Ochinus. Through these men, and more directly by correspondence with the leading reformers of the kingdom, Calvin, as is well known, exerted a salutary influence upon the religious changes in the church of England. Other countries also shared in his labours. In 1545 he was in correspondence with the reformed churches of East Friesland, to whom he dedicated his catechism. In 1549 he addressed his commentary on the Hebrews to Sigismund Augustus, king of Poland. At a still later period he was in correspondence with the Christians of Denmark.

It is characteristic of Calvin, that no troubles, public or domestic, seem to have diminished his labours as an author. During the stormiest period of his history, he found time to edit Melancthon's *Loci Communes* with a preface, A.D. 1546. In 1544 he published a work against the Libertines, together with one against the Anabaptists; also a letter to the church at Rouen, against certain Libertines whom he calls New-Carpocratians; also a Treatise against relics. In 1545 a Latin Translation of the French Catechism. In 1548 Commentaries on the epistles to the Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and on the epistles to Timothy. In 1549, his *Consensio in re sacramentaria*, and an excellent work against Astrology. In two of these, the works against Relics and against Astrology, he rose much above his age, and evinced, as he did on all analogous subjects, a rationality and freedom from superstition which it took almost two centuries to make universal, if indeed this can be said to be the case even now.

No part of M. Henry's archaeological investigations has produced more copious results than those which concern the war that was waged against Calvin within the walls of his own city, by the party of Libertines. These were men who turned the grace of God into lasciviousness. Like the Anabaptists, from whom they are not always distinguishable, they owed their origin to the excitement and convulsion of an age when a new element was evolved in the social state.

While the Lord was sowing good seed, the enemy was sowing tares, and the world was agitated by theories subversive of all morals and all civil government. Alas! the crop is not extinct, in our age, or even in our own country. Neither the mighty labours of Luther, nor the death of Münzer, availed entirely to suppress the fanatical spirit. The chief dogma of the Anabaptists was the rejection of pedobaptism. The Libertines went further, and were pantheists of the crudest sort, and enemies of all righteousness. Calvin wrote against both. His work against the Libertines bears the date 1544 in the Amsterdam edition: that against the Anabaptists is of the same year.

Holding false opinions respecting liberty and grace, these men rushed into the most horrid enormities of practical Antinomianism, uniting this with a mystical jargon which was sometimes blasphemous. They avowed, as their cardinal dogma, that there is but one spirit in the universe.* In France many of the higher classes were infected with this plague. Even the queen of Navarre was led far astray by two favourite teachers, Quintin and Poques. M. Henry gives an original letter of Calvin to the queen, in which there is such severity of reprehension and courageous faithfulness as have seldom been addressed to crowned heads.

There was perhaps no place on earth in which this anti-christian Libertinism revealed its hideous features more fully than at Geneva. It was there an organized system of infidelity, licentiousness, and blasphemy. A work was written by a man named Gruet, of which the object was to show that the founders of Judaism and Christianity were alike impostors, and that Christ was justly crucified. The author was put to death for sedition and blasphemy, agreeably to the harsh and intolerant jurisprudence which was universal at that day. We cannot enter into the painful details. Many of the horrible impieties of this man are recited by M. Henry. It was in connexion with such opinions that the impurity of morals prevailed to an extent almost incredible. Opposition to the truth, and to the rigid discipline of the church, drove the libertine party to the direst extreme of malignity. Prostitution and violence were practised almost without a veil. The history of Madame Ameaux, the wife of one of the civil counsellors, is given by our author, and displays at a glance the diabolical tendency of a system which could thus oblite-

* See Calvin's Institut. l. 3. c. 3. p. 14.

rate the last trace of chaste reserve even in a matron of the highest rank.

During the prevalence of the plague in Geneva, the wickedness of the people arose to its acme. In their unaccountable fury of impious revenge, some of this party succeeded in persuading themselves and many others, that it was in their power to communicate the contagion by some virus which they carried about with them, sprinkled on food, and spread upon the bolts and latches of doors. Men were known to come to Geneva expressly to buy this poison, and many avowed their intention to use it against their enemies. Calvin thundered from the pulpit against the iniquity of the city, declared the pestilence to be a judgment of God, and forewarned the authorities of greater wrath unless they would take stronger measures against the overspreading scourge of incontinence in its worst forms. Besides those whom we have mentioned, there were many political Libertines, as they were called, whose sole object was to oppose the theocratic tendency of Calvin's system, and to free their city from subjection to Savoy and Berne. These were not necessarily connected with the religious Libertines. Their leader, Perrin, does not seem to have been actuated so much by any antichristian zeal, as by ambition. In the way of these partizans the Reformer was a rock of offence; for so long as his eloquence and his iron will remained, they could not advance a step. It was a trait of Calvin's policy, that when he found the city almost overwhelmed by corrupt men, he resolved to gather around him spirits of a purer sort. The persecutions, especially in France, favoured his plan. Refugees rallied around his banner, from Italy, Flanders, and Spain. New churches were erected in which there was divine service in the Flemish, the Italian, the Spanish, and the English tongues. Not even the plague deterred these exiles from coming to the free city, and hundreds of young men were found sitting at the feet of Calvin, who were afterwards the missionaries of the reformed faith in their respective countries. His influence gained by every such accession until he finally rose above all opposition.

It may be supposed however that the Libertines did not allow this change to take place without rage and conflict; but the more infuriated they became, the more secure was Calvin. He gave free course to the law, which made itself felt as well upon the proudest senator as on the populace. The preface to his Commentary on the Psalms will be more in-

telligible and interesting to one who bears in mind these statements. An accusation was brought against Calvin, as a preacher of falsehood and a bad man, by Pierre Ameaux, one of the Council of Two Hundred. Calvin was unanimously acquitted, and the accuser himself, on being fined sixty dollars, made ample retractation. Calvin however insisted on a public penance in the streets, a severe sentence which was accordingly pronounced and executed.

Perrin, the chief opposer, had married a daughter of the noble house of Faber; she was a woman of great strength of character; indeed Calvin once says *uxor est prodigiosa furia*. This woman, and the whole party were excessively galled by the regulations against stage-plays, promiscuous dancing, and sumptuous apparel. As might have been expected, many trials resulted from this, and some cases of imprisonment; and all who fell under the censure of the law considered themselves as personally injured by Calvin. Thus the party opposed to the ministers became stronger and stronger. It was evident that they would stop at nothing in accomplishing their purpose; and both the courage and the address of Calvin were put to the test. He writes to Viret, September 17, 1547: "Our enemies are so blinded, that they know no longer what caution is. Yesterday served not a little to confirm the previous suspicion, that their temerity would soon excite a tumult. The Council of Two Hundred had been summoned, and I had informed my colleagues that I meant to go to the Council. We were there even before the hour, as many were walking up and down without. We retired by the door nearest to the Council-chamber. Here was heard a very tumultuous outcry, which so increased, that I soon recognised in it the sure sign of an insurrection. I immediately ran to them. The sight was fearful. I threw myself into the thickest of the throng. Though much agitated, all hastened to me, and tried to bear me hither and thither, to save me from harm. I called God and men to witness that I came to offer my body to their swords, and besought them, if blood must be shed, to begin with me." "At length I was forced into the meeting of the Council. Here was a new conflict, into the midst of which I cast myself. All are of the opinion that by my presence I prevented a great and horrible carnage. My colleagues, meanwhile, mixed themselves with the mass. I requested that they would quietly be seated. By a long and earnest speech, which I made suitably to the circumstances, all were won-

derfully agitated." Farel and Viret came twice to Geneva to reconcile the parties. The former, before the Council, said of his friend: "How could you do otherwise than honour Calvin, as no man upon earth has warred against antichrist with so much power. There is none so learned, and if he does not spare you, neither has he spared the greatest men—Luther and Melancthon." The contest with Perrin broke out ever and anon, until he was finally excluded from the city; which however does not fall within the period comprised in this volume.

Through these, and the like scenes perpetually recurring, Calvin went forward, and did not bate one jot of his characteristic firmness and fidelity. The pulpit resounded with the most unsparing denunciation of vice, and was therefore the principal object of detestation on the part of the libertines. We leave to the foes of Calvin to explain the paradox, that at the time when, if they are to be believed, he was labouring to propagate a system which subverts all morals, and opens the door to licentiousness, his chief enemies and persecutors were the avowed patrons of luxury and uncleanness, and the most bitter charges which they brought against him were founded on the rigour and alleged intolerance of his moral code. His opposers tried him with every variety of malicious assault. He was insulted in the streets, and his life was threatened. Beza relates that they gave the name of Calvin to their dogs. Even the Senate sometimes hindered him in the publication of his works; and called him in question for some of his private letters. "I am prepared," said he, "to undergo any species of death, for the defence of the truth." "With a good conscience, I fear no assaults; for what can they accomplish worse than death?" So far from clinging to Geneva from ambitious views, nothing detained him but the force of conscience. His soul was among lions. In expectation of the Lord's Supper, he writes to Farel: "If it could be solemnized without me, I would be willing to creep to you on my hands and knees." "I bring my sacrificed heart," said he, "as a gift to God. I submit my burdened, straitened soul in obedience to God." "Yet," said he, with admirable self-neglect, "when I consider to what insults my brethren are subjected, I seem to myself almost to be engaged in a mock-contest."*

* *Sed cum reputo, quales insultus fratribus nostris sustinendi sunt, videor mihi propemodum sub umbra certare lusorium certamen.*

In the midst of these troubles, he sought repose in the sympathy of his friends, especially of Viret and Farel. In what concerned practical business, he set most value on the advice of Viret; but Farel had most of his heart. The latter in return used to compare Calvin to Moses; and the analogy is striking.

We are so much accustomed to receive our impressions of Calvin from his enemies that we too often look on him as a mere polemic. Such he was not; but on the contrary, there seems to be no one of his many controversies into which he thrust himself wilfully. He was a lover of peace, and there was no object in life so dear to him as the promotion of entire unity among all evangelical believers. Not even the pacification of Geneva was half so dear to him as this. It was with this in view that he did every thing to further the acceptance of the *Consensus Tigurinus*, in which he hoped, especially after Luther's death, that the Christians not only of France and Switzerland, but of Germany, would unite. "And thus," says M. Henry, "the church would have formed a great connected whole, and Calvin, by his zealous, yet truly conciliating endeavours, would have made that good, which Luther in his heat had destroyed." Towards this contemplated union it was a principal step to bring the Swiss brethren to admit a spiritual but real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, which indeed many of them secretly held. In Berne there was much contention, and Viret was in controversy with Sulzer. In Zurich, there were those who charged Viret and Calvin with defection to the Lutheran tenet: this suspicion vanished when Calvin accompanied Farel to Zurich in 1548: for the venerable Farel was as efficient in peace as in war. The *Consensus Tigurinus* was opposed chiefly by Westphal, a hot-headed Lutheran of Hamburg, and by other unwise but fiery spirits of his communion. This formulary, which acquired the force of a church-symbol, was adopted in 1549, and marks an epoch in the Sacramentarian controversy. In 1554, it was revised and amended. Our author gives specimens of the letters which Calvin wrote in order to conciliate Bullinger and the other Zuinglians; for though our Reformer used to call Bullinger a *durum caput*, they were always close friends, and in 1547 Bullinger submitted one of his works to Calvin's revision.

The essays towards a general union were going on favourably at the entrance of the year 1549. This was to Calvin a year of mingled joy and sorrow. The libertine faction in

Geneva was for a time subdued; but the churches of Saxony were in a ferment upon the question concerning 'things indifferent.' During this year Calvin underwent a severe trial in the death of his wife. After this event, and after the happy termination of the synod of the Swiss and French ministers at Berne, Calvin and Farel, as has been intimated above, made a tour through the Swiss churches, for the purpose of promoting unity of opinion and feeling. In September he writes to Viret concerning the probable effects of the *Consensus*: "The hearts of the pious will be lifted up and our constancy and boldness will contribute much, in these unhappy times, to break the hearts of the wicked. Those who have thought ill of us, will see that our thoughts are good and just. Many who are now wavering in uncertainty will know what they have to rely upon. Those in foreign lands who differ from us in opinion will soon, I hope, reach out the hand to us. And finally, at all events, posterity will have such a testimony of our faith as they could never gather from our controversies." And indeed, as Planck has observed, by this Zurich Confession was properly accomplished, or at least evinced, the entire reconciliation of the Swiss with the Lutheran theology on the points first in debate." There was universal joy among all the Protestant churches, and all united in ascribing to Calvin the principal agency in this union. The mournful events by which it was violated fall under another period.

While Calvin was engaged in these labours, there came from France to Geneva eight men of rank, flying from persecution. Among them was one who was pre-eminent for his commanding countenance and figure, as well as for genius and accomplishment, but who was still much attached to the world. In this man Calvin recognised a friend of his youthful days. It was Theodore Beza, of Vezelay, in Burgundy. They asked leave of the Council to remain in Geneva, and Calvin, with affectionate impetuosity, conjured Beza to abide with him and join in his labours. He had previously learned from Melchior Wolmar the talents of Beza, and saw in him the very man whom God had sent to be his right arm, and finally to take his place in the consistory. Beza established himself at Geneva, and under the influence of Calvin became one of the most useful men of the age. For a time he was at Lausanne, as professor of Greek. At the request of the French refugees he there expounded the epistle to the Romans, and also laid the foundation for his learned work on

the New Testament. From this time forward Calvin undertook nothing without Beza, who became the eloquent interpreter and powerful defender of his opinions, as he was afterwards his successor and biographer. The enthusiastic friendship of Beza became more firm and pure as he entered more and more into the fellowship of faith with his preceptor and patron.

Though this was certainly the most striking, it was by no means the only instance of this influence upon men of learning. From every part of reformed Christendom such persons were attracted by the genius, the learning, and the pious energy of Calvin. We have already named Peter Martyr Vermili. He was called by Calvin *Miraculum Italiae*. Another Italian was Bernardino Ochino of Siena, whom Calvin designated as *praeclarus vir*, and *vir magnus omnibus modis*. In this connexion it is interesting to mark the relation of our Reformer to that heresiarch Laelius Socinus. Calvin treated this learned man with great tenderness, for he thought he perceived in him a real desire for the truth; and he even gave him letters of recommendation when he went into Poland. We cannot, however, add to the length of this article by any extracts from their correspondence.

M. Henry closes his volume with a section upon the agreement between Calvin and Luther in living faith. The subject is one which has been much discussed, and while we arrive at no new results, we gain from M. Henry's investigation corroboration to our previous belief. On the Sacramentarian controversy, it is true, they never came to a clear understanding, but there was a hearty concurrence in all that related to the vital truths of religion. M. Henry goes somewhat into the question whether Luther and Calvin coincided in opinion concerning Predestination and Election, or whether on the other hand Luther changed his mind on these points, as has been alleged by the Arminians and modern Lutherans. The truth seems to be this, that Luther always retained his belief in the doctrine of unconditional election to life, but that he became cautious in his expressions concerning it, and justly fearful of its being abused to the purposes of fatalistic Antinomianism. It has been argued, from certain passages in Luther's later writings, that he had abandoned the doctrine, but M. Henry shows very conclusively that these are aimed entirely against its abuse, and has cited exactly similar passages from Calvin; as, for example, the following: "We are not of the number of these fantastic spirits, who, under

the shadow of God's eternal predestination, make no account of coming to the promised life *by the right way*; but we rather hold, that to be owned as children of God, it is necessary that we believe in Jesus Christ, because it is in him alone that we must seek for all that pertains to his salvation." Calvin and Melancthon, however, differed considerably upon this point in later years, when the latter, in Calvin's judgment, treated it *nimis philosophice*.

There is in Hering's Brandenburg Church-History a pleasant story which throws light upon the mutual relation of the two great Reformers. We have only to regret that in detailing an anecdote which takes us back to the heart of old Wittenberg, we can make so feeble an approach to the savoury humour of the idiomatic Saxon. "So soon," the history states, "as Calvin's book, made German by Galasio, appeared anew in print in 1545, and was brought to Wittenberg, Dr. Luther, on the Monday after *Quasimodogeniti*, after the lecture then holden by him on Genesis, went to the shop of Moritz Goltzsch, the bookseller. He bade welcome the bookseller who had just come home from the Shrovetide Fair, and accosted him with these words: 'Well Moritz, what is the best news from Frankfort? Are they minded to burn up the arch-heretic Luther?' whereupon Moritz Goltzsch made answer thus: 'Of that hear I nothing, reverend Sir; but I have here brought with me a little book, on the Supper of our Lord, written first in French, by John Calvin, but now set forth anew in Latin. They say abroad of Calvin, that he is, though a young, yet a pious and a learned man. And in the little book aforesaid, Calvin is said to show, wherein your reverence, and wherein Zuinglius and Oecolampadius have exceeded in the dispute about the holy sacrament.' When Moritz Goltzsch had imprudently said this, Dr. Luther immediately replied, 'Give me rather the book.' Upon which the bookseller gave him an *exemplar in octavo*, bound in leather, which Dr. Luther took into his hands, and sitting down began to read the first three pages after the title, and the last four and a half at the end, and then said: 'Moritz, this is surely a learned and pious man, to whom I might well have committed the whole matter of this dispute from the beginning. On my part I confess, if the other party had done the like, we had soon been reconciled; for if Oecolampadius and Zuinglius had so explained themselves at the first, we had never gone into so lengthened a disputation.' Besides many other of the students who were standing around Dr. Luther

at the time, this was heard by Matthias Stoius, then Dr. Luther's table-companion, but afterwards Doctor of Medicine, and body-physician to the old Duke of Prussia, who many times related it to the Duke, in the presence of many distinguished people of quality."

With this characteristic incident we close our notice of the work, hoping at some future day to follow the history to its conclusion.

ART. III.—*A Brief History and Vindication of the Doctrines received and established in the Churches of New England, with a specimen of the New Scheme of Religion beginning to prevail.* By Thomas Clap, A.M., President of Yale College. New Haven, 1755.

OUR readers may be somewhat surprised at seeing, as the heading of this article, the title of a book published near a century ago. The character of this periodical, however, does not restrict us to the notice of works of a recent date. The past is the mirror of the present, as the present is of the future. What is now, has been before, and shall be hereafter. It is well, at times, to look back and see how the trials of our forefathers agree with our own; to observe how the errors and disorders with which we have to contend afflicted them; to notice how the methods adopted in former ages to secure the introduction of false doctrines answer to the devices of the present day; and how signally God blessed the faithful efforts of his servants in defence of his truth, and how uniformly compromise and subserviency have been followed by the triumph of error and the decline of religion. The history of the church is replete with instructions on all these points; and these instructions are presented in the history of the church in our own country in a form peculiarly adapted to our present circumstances. The pious founders of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches in America brought with them the very doctrines which the friends of truth in those churches are now struggling to maintain; they had to contend with the same errors and disorders, and they resisted them by the same means which we are now endeavouring to employ, viz. testimony, discussion and discipline. Their fidelity produced just the same outcry about ecclesiastical

tyranny, inquisitorial powers, freedom of thought, march of intellect, new discoveries, with which the ears of the public are now assailed. The same plea of essential agreement, of mere *shades* of difference, of the evils of controversy, was urged then, as now. But, blessed be God, not with the same success. The men of those generations did not allow themselves to be either frightened or beguiled. And as long as they retained their courage and fidelity their efforts were crowned with success.

There is another instructive feature in the history of the last century. Those who could not endure sound doctrine, would not endure sound discipline. As soon as they had departed from the faith, they got their eyes wide open to the evils of ecclesiastical authority. This opposition to supervision manifested itself in Connecticut in two ways. Some objected to the examination into the doctrinal opinions of ministers, or to the exercise of discipline for the prevailing errors; while others withdrew from the consociated churches and set up for themselves. These separatists called themselves strict Congregationalists. One of their standing subjects of complaint was the supervision of the consociation. This was found to be very inconvenient. It is readily admitted that many Christians have honestly and from good motives preferred the purely independent system of church government, yet there can be no doubt that then, as now, many who advocated that system did it because of the convenient latitude which it affords for all kinds of doctrine.

So much has been said of late years of the contentions in the Presbyterian church; such assiduous efforts have been made to produce the impression that there is either some great evil in Presbyterianism, or that its present advocates are peculiarly and wickedly bigotted, that we have thought it wise, and likely in various ways to be useful, to recall attention to one chapter of the ecclesiastical history of Connecticut. It will be seen that so long as there is a regard for divine truth and for real religion in the church, there will be controversy and contention when errorists arise and endeavour to propagate their doctrines. There can be no surer sign of degeneracy than the peaceful progress of error. If, therefore, the same or analogous errors and disorders, which a century ago agitated many parts of New England to its centre, are now allowed to prevail without opposition, it will prove to all the world that the faith and the spirit of the Puritans have perished among their descendants. It is not

our intention, though largely in the debt of a certain class of our New England brethren, to read them a lesson out of their own history. It is not for their benefit so much as for our own, that we bring to the notice of our readers President Clap's Defence of the Doctrines of the New England Churches. It will serve to confirm the purpose and strengthen the faith of the friends of truth in our church, to see that they are fighting the same battle which has once before been fought and won, and that on New England ground. It will serve to refute the calumny of those who represent the struggle in our church, as an opposition to genuine New England doctrines. It will show that we are now opposing what all sound and faithful Puritans ever have resisted; and that the reproaches which we now suffer were just as freely lavished on New England men a hundred years ago.

There is so little in this pamphlet which is not directly applicable to the present times, that we shall do little more than extract its contents, giving, it may be, an occasional remark, by way of application or improvement.

"The great motive," says President Clap, "which induced the first planters of New England, to leave their pleasant European seats, and settle in this howling wilderness, was, that they might enjoy religion in the purity of its doctrines, discipline and worship, and transmit the same down to the latest posterity. The doctrines which they believed and professed, were those which had been generally established in all ages of the Christian church; and more especially summed up, and declared in the several confessions of faith, in the various churches of the protestant Reformation; though there were some lesser circumstances in their ecclesiastical discipline, which were in some measure peculiar to themselves. For the sake of these inestimable privileges, they undertook to settle a new and uncultivated country, filled with the most savage and barbarous enemies; and nothing but these religious prospects could induce them to believe that they did not purchase it at too dear a rate. And the leaving the gospel in its purity, they judged to be a better inheritance to their posterity, than the valuable soil which they acquired with such incredible hardship, danger and fatigue: therefore any attempt to deprive them of their religion, is as injurious as to deprive them of their lands, or to change their happy form of civil government.

"Soon after their first settlement, there was a general Synod of the elders and messengers of all the churches in New

England, in the year 1648, wherein they unanimously declared their sentiments in the doctrines of the gospel, in these words, *viz.* ‘This Synod, having perused and considered, (with much gladness of heart, and thankfulness to God,) the Confession of Faith lately published by the Reverend Assembly in England, do judge it to be very holy, orthodox and judicious in all matters of faith; and do therefore freely and fully consent thereunto, for the substance; only in matters of church government and discipline, we refer ourselves to the platform of church discipline agreed upon by this assembly.’ And accordingly published it as ‘their Confession of Faith, and as the doctrine constantly taught and professed in these churches.’

“In their preface they say, ‘that it has been the laudable practice of the churches of Christ, in all ages, to give a public account to the world, of the faith and order of the gospel among them; and that it has a tendency to public edification, by maintaining the faith entire in itself, and unity and harmony with other churches.’

“Our churches, say they, believe and profess the same doctrine which has been generally received in all the reformed churches in Europe. I suppose the Assembly’s Catechism was not expressly mentioned, because before this it had been generally received and taught to children.

“A few years after there was a Synod of Congregational churches held at the Savoy, in London; wherein they consented to the Westminster confession aforesaid; only they left out some things relating to church discipline and divorce, and amended some few expressions. This is called the Savoy Confession.

“A general Synod of the elders and messengers of the churches in New England, in 1680, approved of and consented to this confession; and the general court at Boston ordered it to be printed ‘for the benefit of the churches in the present and after times.’ The Synod, in their preface, say, ‘That it must needs tend much to the honour of the blessed name of the Lord Jesus, when many churches join together in their testimony for the truth. That the Lord hath signally owned the confessions of the four first general councils or Synods for the suppression of heresies in the primitive times. That the confessions of the Bohemians, Waldenses, and other Protestant reformed churches (which also show what harmony of doctrine there is among all sincere professors of the truth) have been of singular use, not only to those

who then lived, but also to posterity, even to this day. That it must needs be a work pleasing unto God, for his servants to declare to the world, what those principles of truth are, which they have received, and purpose to live and die in the profession of; nor are they worthy of the name of Christians, who refuse to declare what they believe.' They conclude with these words, 'What hours of temptation may overtake these churches, is not for us to say; only the Lord doth many times so order things, that when his people have made a good confession, they shall be put upon the trial, some way or other, concerning their sincerity in it. The Lord grant, that the loins of our minds may be so girt about with truth, that we may be able to withstand in an evil day, and having done all to stand.

"In the year 1690, there was a meeting of the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers in England, who, agreeing perfectly in points of doctrine, compromised those small circumstantialities wherein they had disagreed in church discipline. This they published under the title of, *Heads of Agreement assented to by the united Ministers formerly called the Presbyterian and Congregational*. In which they declare their approbation of 'the doctrinal articles of the church of England; the Confession of Faith; the larger and shorter Catechisms composed by the assembly of divines at Westminster, and the Savoy Confession, as agreeable to the word of God.'

"In the year 1708, there was a general Synod of all the churches in the colony of Connecticut, assembled by delegation, at Saybrook, in which they unanimously consented to the Savoy Confession, and the heads of agreement before mentioned; and drew up some articles for the administration of church discipline. One principal thing wherein these articles differed from what had been before generally received and practiced in the New English churches, was this, that whereas the Cambridge platform had said in general terms, that councils should consist of the neighbouring churches, and some questions had arisen who should be esteemed the neighbouring churches, and what number should be called in particular cases: these articles reduced it to a greater certainty, that councils should consist of the neighbouring churches in the county; they forming themselves into one or more consociations for that purpose.

"These three things, viz. the Confession of Faith; Heads of Agreement, and Articles of Church Discipline, were presented to the General Court at Hartford, in May 1708; and

they declared their great approbation of them, and 'ordain, that all the churches in this government, thus united in doctrine, worship and discipline, shall be owned and acknowledged established by law.'

"The Synod of Saybrook, in their preface, say, that 'the usage of the Christian church, whose faith rested wholly on the word of God, respecting confessions of faith, is very ancient; and necessary for the correcting, condemning, and suppressing of heresy and error. For this purpose, ancient and famous confessions of faith have been agreed upon by Oecumenical councils, e. g. of Nice, against Arius; of Constantinople, against Macedonius, &c. That the several reformed nations agreed upon confessions of faith, famous in the world, and of special service to theirs and the succeeding ages. That the faith of these churches is the same which was generally received in all the reformed churches in Europe. This confession of faith, they say, they offer as their firm persuasion, well and truly grounded on the word of God, and commend the same to the people of this colony, to be examined, accepted and constantly maintained. That having applied the rule of holy Scripture to the articles of this confession,* and found the same to be the eternal truths of God, you remember and hold them fast: *contend earnestly for them, as the faith once delivered to the saints*: value them as your great charter; the instrument of your salvation, and the evidence of your not failing of the grace of God, and of your receiving a crown that fadeth not away. Maintain them, and every of them, all your days, with undaunted resolution, against all opposition, whatever the event may be; and the same transmit safe and pure to posterity; having bought the truth, sell it not: believe the truth will make you free. Faithful is he that hath promised. Let no man take away your crown.'

"In this state our pious fore-fathers established the pure religion of Christ in this land, and left it as the best legacy to their posterity. They were doubtless men of great piety; fervent in prayer, and assiduous in studying the sacred Scriptures, in order to find out the truth, and recommend it to their posterity. They did not undertake to make a religion, but to declare it from the word of God: nor did they suppose that their faith or belief should be the ground and

* "By this is meant, not the applying those few texts of Scripture only, which are set in the margin, (for it is probable they were not put there by the Assembly of Divines) but every text of Scripture applicable to these articles."

foundation of ours, but resolved all into the authority of God speaking in his word.

“Among the various means they used to propagate this pure religion to their posterity, they esteemed the erecting of colleges and subordinate schools, to be the principal. To this purpose the general synod at Boston, in 1679, fully express their sentiments. ‘That we read of schools and colleges in scripture; 1 Chron. 25: 8, Mal. 2: 12, Acts 19: 9, and 22: 3. That Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha, were presidents of the schools of the prophets; 1 Sam. 19: 18. That Ecclesiastical History informs us, that great care was taken by the apostles, and their immediate successors, to settle schools at all places; that so the interest of religion might be preserved, and truth propagated to all succeeding generations. We have reason to bless God, who hath put it into the hearts of our fathers, to take care in this matter; for these churches would have been in a deplorable state, if the Lord had not blessed the college, so as thence to supply most of our churches.’

“‘When the people in New England were poor, and but few in number, there was a spirit to encourage learning; and as we desire that religion should flourish, it concerns us to endeavour that the college and inferior schools be duly inspected and encouraged.’ Thus far that synod.

“The fathers of the colony of Connecticut, from the same pious and religious design, erected a college among themselves in the year 1701: the scheme was concerted principally by the ministers, with an especial design to maintain and propagate that pure religion, which was before settled among them; as appears by sundry letters to and from those ministers who first undertook to found this school, dated before the charter, and still extant.

“The charter is predicated, ‘upon the petition of sundry well-disposed persons, of their *sincere regard to and zeal for upholding and propagating of the Christian Protestant religion, by a succession of learned and orthodox men.*’ And the grant was made, ‘to encourage such a *pious and religious undertaking.*’ At their first meeting they came into the following solemn act.

“At a meeting of the collegiate undertakers, holden at Saybrook, November 11, A.D. 1701, present, the Revs. Israel Chauncey, Thomas Buckingham, Abraham Pierson, Samuel Andrew, James Pierpoint, Noadiab Russel, Joseph Webb.

“‘Whereas it was the glorious public design of our now

blessed fathers, in their remove from Europe into these parts of America, both to plant, and under the Divine blessing, to propagate in this wilderness the blessed reformed Protestant religion, in the purity of its order and worship; not only to their posterity, but also to the barbarous natives: in which great enterprise they wanted not the royal commands and favour of his majesty king Charles the Second, to authorize and invigorate them.

“ We, their unworthy posterity, lamenting our past neglects of this grand errand, and sensible of the equal obligations better to prosecute the same end, are desirous in our generation to be serviceable thereunto.

“ Whereunto the religious and liberal education of suitable youth is, under the blessing of God, a chief and most probable expedient. Therefore, that we might not be wanting in cherishing the present observable and pious disposition of many well-minded people, to dedicate their children and substance unto God in such a good service: and being ourselves with sundry other Reverend Elders, not only desired by our goodly people, to undertake as trustees, for erecting, forming, ordering and regulating a collegiate school, for the advancement of such an education: but having also obtained of our present religious government, both full liberty and assistance, by their donations to such an use: tokens likewise that particular persons will not be wanting in their beneficence: do, in duty to God, and the weal of our country, undertake in the aforesaid design. And being now met, according to the liberties and aids now granted to us for the use aforesaid; do order and appoint, that there shall be, and hereby is erected and formed a collegiate school, wherein shall be taught the liberal arts and languages, in such place or places in Connecticut, as the said trustees with their associates and successors, do or shall, from time to time, see cause to order.

“ For the orderly and effectual management of this affair, we agree to, and hereby appoint and confirm the following rules:

“ 1st. That the rector take special care, as of the moral behaviour of the students at all times, so with industry, to instruct and ground them well in theoretical divinity; and to that end, shall neither by himself, nor by any other person whomsoever, allow them to be instructed and grounded in any other system or synopsis of divinity, than such as the said trustees do order and appoint: but shall take effectual

care, that the said students be weekly, at such seasons as he shall see cause to appoint, caused memoriter to recite the Assembly's Catechism in Latin, and Ames's Theological Theses; of which, as also Ames's Cases, he shall make, or cause to be made, from time to time, such explanations as may (through the blessing of God,) be most conducive to their establishment in the principles of the Christian Protestant religion.

“2d. The rector shall also cause the Scripture daily (except on the Sabbath) morning and evening, to be read by the students at the times of prayer in the school, according to the laudable order and usages of Harvard College, making expositions upon the same: and upon the Sabbath, shall either expound practical theology, or cause the non-graduated students to repeat sermons; and in all other ways according to his best discretion, shall at all times studiously endeavour, in the education of the students, *to promote the power and purity of religion and the best edification of these New England churches.*”

“The founders of the college, and their successors, have upon several times and occasions, come into some further and more explicit resolves, in pursuance to the original fundamental plan; particularly,

“At a meeting of the trustees of Yale College, in New Haven, October 17, 1722: present, the Rev. Messrs. Samuel Andrew, Timothy Woodbridge, Samuel Russell, Joseph Webb, John Davenport, Thomas Buckingham, Stephen Buckingham, Thomas Ruggles, Eliphalet Adams.

“16. Voted, That all such persons as shall hereafter be elected to the office of rector or tutor in this college, shall, before they are accepted therein, before the trustees, declare their assent to the confession of faith owned and consented to by the elders and messengers of the churches in the Colony of Connecticut, assembled by delegation at Saybrook, Sept. 9, 1708, and confirmed by act of the General Assembly; and shall particularly give satisfaction to them, of the soundness of their faith, in opposition to Arminian and Prelatical corruptions, or any other of dangerous consequence to the purity and peace of our churches: but if it cannot be before the trustees, it shall be in the power of any two trustees, with the rector, to examine a tutor, with respect to the confession and soundness of faith, in opposition to said corruptions.

“17. Voted, That upon just ground of suspicion of the rector or tutor's inclination to Arminian or Prelatic princi-

ples, a meeting of the trustees shall be called, as soon as may be, to examine into the case.

“ 18. Voted, That if any other officer or member of this college shall give just grounds of suspicion of their being corrupted with Arminian or Prelatical principles,* or of any other of dangerous consequence to the peace and purity of our churches, the rector and tutors shall call them upon examination according to the articles of the said confession; and in case they refuse to submit thereto, or do not give a satisfactory account of their uncorruptness, they shall suspend them to the next meeting of the trustees.’

“ N. B. Five of the first founders were at this time alive, and four present at the passing of these acts.

“ At a meeting of the president and fellows of Yale College, November 21, 1751, present, the Rev. Mr. Thomas Clap, President: the Rev. Messrs. Jared Eliot, Joseph Noyes, Anthony Stoddard, Benjamin Lord, William Russel, Thomas Ruggles, Solomon Williams, and Noah Hobart, Fellows.

“ Whereas the principal design of the pious founders of this college was to educate and train up youth for the ministry in the churches of this Colony, according to the doctrine, discipline and mode of worship received and practised in them; and they particularly ordered, that the students should be established in the principles of religion, and grounded in polemical divinity, according to the Assembly’s Catechism, Dr. Ames’s Medulla, and Cases of Conscience, and that special care should be taken, in the education of students, not to suffer them to be instructed in any different principles or doctrines; and that all proper methods or measures should be taken to promote the power and purity of religion, and the best edification and peace of these churches:

“ We, the successors of the said founders, being in our own judgments, of the same principles in religion with our predecessors, and esteeming ourselves bound in fidelity to the trust committed to us, to carry on the same design, and

* “By Prelatical principles, I suppose, they intend, the opinion that Prelacy or Episcopacy is, by divine right, absolutely necessary to the being of the Christian ministry and church; which opinion being entirely subversive of these churches which the college was founded to support; those who endeavour to propagate it, counteract the fundamental design of the college: but such as suppose, that Episcopacy is only most convenient, as tending to maintain unity and order, and don’t nullify Presbyterian ordination (which is the opinion of the greatest part of the church of England, in England), may consistently be admitted members of our college, and to the communion of our churches too, as has been the practice ever since there have been churchmen in the Colony.”

improve all the college estate descended to us, for the purposes for which it was given, do explicitly and fully resolve, as follows, viz

“1. That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only rule of faith and practice, in all matters of religion, and the standard by which all doctrines, principles and practices in religion are to be tried and judged.

“2. That the Assembly's Catechism and the Confession of Faith, received and established in the churches of this Colony (which is an abridgement of the Westminster Confession), contain a true and just summary of the most important doctrines of the Christian religion; and that the true sense of the sacred Scriptures is justly collected and summed up in these compositions: and all expositions of Scripture, pretending to deduce any doctrines or positions, contrary to the doctrines laid down in these composures, we are of opinion are wrong and erroneous.

“3. If any doubt or dispute should happen to arise about the true meaning and sense of any particular terms or phrases in the said composures, they shall be understood and taken in the same sense in which such terms and phrases have been generally used in the writings of Protestant divines, and especially in their public confessions of faith.*

“4. That we will always take all proper and reasonable measures, such as Christian prudence shall direct, to continue and propagate the doctrines contained in these summaries of religion, in this college, and to transmit them to all future successions and generations; and to use the like measures to prevent the contrary doctrines from prevailing in this society.

“5. That every person who shall hereafter be chosen a president, fellow, professor of divinity, or tutor, in this college, shall, before he enters upon the execution of his office, publicly give his consent to the catechism and confession of faith, as containing a just summary of the Christian religion, as before expressed, and renounce all doctrines or principles contrary thereunto: and shall pass through such an examination as the corporation shall think proper, in order to their being fully satisfied that he shall do it truly without any evasion or equivocation.

* “The general rule of interpreting all writings, is, that words and phrases shall be taken in the same sense in which they are commonly used in other writings upon the same subject.”

“ 6. That since every such officer is admitted into his post upon the condition aforesaid, if he shall afterwards change his sentiments, entertain any contrary set of principles or scheme of religion, and disbelieve the doctrines contained in the said catechism or confession of faith, he cannot, consistent with common honesty and fidelity, continue in his post, but is bound to resign it.

“ 7. That when it is suspected by any of the corporation, that any such officer has fallen from the profession of his faith, as before mentioned, and is gone into any contrary scheme of principles, he shall be examined by the corporation.

“ 8. That inasmuch as it is especially necessary, that a professor of divinity should be sound in the faith; besides the common tests before mentioned, he shall publicly exhibit a full confession of his faith, drawn up by him in his own words and phrases, and shall in full and express terms renounce all such errors as shall in any considerable measure prevail at the time of his introduction; and if any doubt or question shall arise about any doctrine or position, whether it be truth or error, it shall be judged by the word of God taken in that sense of it which is contained and declared in the said catechism and confession of faith; as being a just exposition of the word of God in those doctrines or articles which are contained in them.*

“ 9. That every person who shall be chosen president, fellow, professor of divinity, or tutor in this college, shall give his consent to the rules of church discipline established in the ecclesiastical constitution of the churches of this Colony: it being understood, that our ecclesiastical constitution may admit of additions or alterations, in such circumstances as according to our confession of faith are to be regulated by the light of nature, and the rules of Christian prudence. And it is especially declared, that if any person shall deny the validity of the ordination of ministers of this Colony, commonly called Presbyterian or Congregational, or shall hold, that it is necessary or convenient that such ministers should be re-ordained, in order to render their administrations valid, it

* “ This does not make the catechism and confession the rule of expounding Scripture (as some have suggested), for the best rule of interpreting Scripture, is the Scripture itself, i. e. comparing one place with another. See Confession, Chap. 1. Sect. 9. It was principally by this means, the Assembly found out the true meaning of Scripture, and expressed and declared it in those compositions.”

shall be deemed an essential departure from our ecclesiastical constitution, and inconsistent with the intentions of the founders of this college, that such a person should be chosen an officer in it.

“ ‘ 10. Yet, we would suppose, that it is not inconsistent with the general design of the founders, and is agreeable to our own inclination, to admit Protestants of all denominations to send their children to receive the advantage of an education in this college: provided that while they are here, they conform to all the laws and orders of it.’ ”

As we understand this matter these statutes were in force until within a few years. It has been said indeed that the usage of the institution, since the accession of President Stiles in 1773, allowed of considerable latitude in this subscription; that the substance of the confession is all that any officer was required to assent to. In reference to this subject the Rev. Daniel Dow of Connecticut, in the appendix to his pamphlet on the New Haven Theology, asks the following question: “Whether the ancient Confession of Faith be not a part of the constitution of Yale College, upon which the funds of the college are established. And if it be, whether the Corporation have any more right or authority to alter it, or repeal it, or to accept of any ascititious creeds as containing the substance of it, than any other corporate body has to alter the conditions of their charter?” We presume Mr. Dow had a right to ask this question. We have never heard whether he has been favoured with an answer. It would seem however that the Dwight Professor of Theology must be greatly straitened in order to avail himself of the liberal usage above referred to. It seems the founders of that professorship required that “Every professor who shall receive the income or the revenue of this fund, shall be examined as to his faith, and be required to make a written declaration thereof, agreeably to the following, ‘I hereby declare my free assent to the Confession of Faith and Ecclesiastical Discipline agreed upon by the churches of the state in the year 1708.’” They further say, “If at any future period, any person who fills the chair of this professorship, holds or teaches doctrines contrary to those above referred to, then it shall be the duty of the Corporation to dismiss such person from office forthwith.” We are no further interested in this matter than the New Haven gentlemen are in the affairs of the Presbyterian church; or than the whole Christian com-

munity is interested in the maintainance of good faith and true religion. We proceed with our extracts.

"The body of the ministers in the Colony of Connecticut, in their public conventions, have several times renewed their consent to their Confession of Faith; particularly at the general council at Guilford, in 1742, and at the general association at Fairfield, 1753, in these words:

" 'We recommend it to the particular associations, that they be very careful, that the true and great doctrines of the gospel, agreeable to the Confession of Faith, be maintained and preached up, against the Arminian, Antinomian, and other errors, and that especial care and pains be taken with our youth, to instruct them in the principles of our holy religion, and articles of our faith.'

"At a general association of the Colony of Connecticut at Middletown, June 17, 1755, present, the Rev. Messrs. Jared Elliot, *Moderator*; Benjamin Colton, John Graham, William Worthington, Solomon Williams, Jacob Elliot, Noah Hobart, Elnathan Whitman, Nathaniel Eells, Jonathan Todd, Edward Eells, Joseph Bellamy, Noah Welles, James Beebe, Izrahiah Wetmore.

" 'This association apprehending that various errors, contrary to the doctrines owned in the churches of this Colony, are spreading and prevailing in the land, and that it is highly necessary for ministers to bear testimony against those prevailing errors; this association earnestly recommend it, to the particular associations of this colony, to agree among themselves, frequently to insist upon these doctrines contained in our Confession of Faith, which are contrary to the prevailing errors of the day; and particularly that they would bear a sufficient testimony against Socinianism, Arminianism, Arianism, Pelagianism, and Antinomianism, or any other errors that may arise among us.

" 'And whereas one particular association of this colony, have declined coming into the proposal of a general consociation, till the several associations have declared their adherence to the Confession of Faith owned in our churches; we freely declare our adherence to the doctrines contained in our Confession of Faith, and we would recommend it to particular associations strictly to adhere to the doctrines of our Confession of Faith.'

"It was the practice of the once famous French Protestant churches, at every meeting of their national Synod, to read and give their assent to their Confession of Faith; and pro-

mise to preach according to it.* And it might be well if this was practised among us; notwithstanding the opposition made by those who dislike the doctrines.

“Although the Protestant churches in general, and those of New England in particular, have been thus fully fixed and established in the pure doctrines of the gospel, yet sundry persons of late have risen up openly to oppose and deny them; and have by various means endeavoured to introduce a new scheme of Religion, and an easy way of salvation, unknown to the gospel of Christ. To this purpose a great variety of books have been written, either expressly denying, or artfully endeavouring to misrepresent, perplex, and undermine the great doctrines of the gospel. Although those authors do not perfectly agree among themselves, yet their scheme is in the main, tolerably consistent with itself, in as much as the denying of some of the doctrines of the gospel (amongst which there is a necessary connection) naturally undermines and destroys all the rest.

“I shall present the reader with a general view of this new scheme of religion, as I some years ago collected it from the writings of Chubb, Taylor, Foster, Hutcheson, Campbell and Ramsey, and other books, which are by some highly extolled and assiduously spread about the country.

““The only end and design of the creation is the happiness of the creature: and this end shall certainly be attained, so that all rational creatures shall finally be happy; or at least, taken together as a body, shall be as happy as they can possibly be; and if some individual should be eternally miserable, it is because it is beyond the power of God to make them happy; it being impossible, that a creature should be happy against its will, and the will cannot be immediately changed without destroying the nature of the agent. God has no authority over his creatures as creator, but only as benefactor, and has no right to command his creatures, but only so far as he annexes rewards to obedience, and makes it their interest to obey: the only criterion of duty to God is self-interest; and God commands us to do things, not out of any regard to his own glory or authority, but merely because the things commanded, naturally tend to promote our own interest and happiness. That he annexes penalties only for the good of the creature, and the only end of punishment is the

* “See Quick’s Synodicon.”

good of those upon whom it is inflicted; or, at least, for the good of the system of moral agents in general.

“The natural tendency which things have to promote our own interest, is the sole criterion of moral good and evil, truth and falsehood, right and wrong, duty and sin. That sin consists in nothing but a man’s doing or forbearing an action contrary to his own interest; and duty to God, is nothing but the pursuit of our own happiness, with this view, that it is the will of God that we should be happy.

“We ought to have no regard to God, but so far as he is or may be a means or instrument of promoting our own happiness, and that to act from a view to the glory of God, his perfection, authority or laws considered as over and above, beside or distinct from our own happiness, is but a chimæra; it being impossible that any moral agent can have any rational view or design, but only its own happiness.

“Since the nature of all sin consists in man’s doing what he knows to be contrary to his own interest and happiness: every sin must be known and voluntary; and consequently there can be no sin of ignorance, derivation or imputation; nor any sinful nature, state or disposition. That Adam was not created in a state of holiness, but only had a power to act virtuously, that is, to pursue his own interest, if he pleased: that he had in his original constitution, strong dispositions and inclinations to do acts that were sinful, i. e. contrary to his own interest, and he could not refrain from those particular acts without considerable pain and uneasiness: that God gave him inclinations which he ought not to gratify, and that an inclination to sin, being the gift of God is no sin, but is designed for the exercise of his virtue in restraining of it.

“Every man is now born into the world in as perfect a state of rectitude as Adam was created; and has no more of a disposition to sin than he had; and in all respects stands as fair for the favour of God as Adam did; not being obliged to be conformed to any standard of moral perfection, but only to pursue his own interest and happiness.

“And though it should be supposed, that men have some weaknesses now, which Adam had not at first; yet nothing can be a man’s duty which is not now in his power, even

* “The author of *Heaven open to all men*, says, if our appetites are irregular, he who gave them is responsible for them.”

though he has lost it by his own fault; for the law is abated in proportion with the power to obey.

“Adam, in a state of innocence, being liable to sickness, wounds and death; there is reason to suppose, that the special providence of God would interpose to preserve him from them. The present miseries and calamities of human life are no evidences of a sinful state, or tokens of God’s displeasure; but are primarily designed as means for the trial of men’s virtue, and to make them capable of a reward.

“Every man has a natural power to prosecute his own interest, and to do all that is necessary to be done by him for his own happiness. The actions of moral agents can be neither virtuous, vicious or free, unless they are done by a man’s own power, nor unless he has also a power to do the contrary; and therefore it is absurd to suppose, that God should implant grace or holiness in any man, or keep him from sin, or decree or foreknow his actions; because all these suppositions destroy the free agency of a man, and consequently his moral virtue.

“That God cannot certainly foreknow the actions of free-agents; because they are not in their own nature fore-knowable; they not depending upon any antecedent causes, but merely upon the free and self-determining power of the will.

“Since sin is nothing else but a man’s not pursuing his own interest; so well as he might, no punishment is properly and justly due to him; but only that he should suffer the natural ill consequences of his own misconduct; consequently no satisfaction is necessary in order to the forgiveness of sin; and therefore Christ did not die to make satisfaction for sin, and so there is no need to suppose him to be essentially God, but only a most perfect and glorious creature.

“The great design of the gospel, and of Christ’s coming into the world, was to revive the light of nature, and to cultivate moral virtue, which had been greatly obscured by Jewish and heathenish superstitions, and to give men more full assurance, that if they endeavoured to promote their own interest in this world, they should be happy in the next, than the mere light of nature could do: and therefore there is no great weight to be laid upon men’s believing Christ’s divinity, satisfaction, or any of those speculative points, which have been generally received as the peculiar and fundamental doctrines of the gospel (some of which are prejudicial to moral virtue), but we ought to have charity for all men, let

their speculative principles be what they will, provided they live moral lives, whether they be Papists, Jews, Mahomedans or heathens: or, at least, for all that say they believe the Bible, though* they put no certain meaning to it, or construction upon it; but only that they believe it to be a good system of morality, and don't profess to believe any thing more about Christ, than the Mohamedans generally do.

"And some have charity for all who are willing to be happy, and have a benevolent temper towards their fellow-men, though they do not so much as believe the being of a God: yea, some extend their charity to the devils themselves, so far as to suppose, that though they are at present very much out of the way, yet they shall at length see their error, and all be finally happy in heaven; and pretend to produce plain demonstration for it in this form:

"The ultimate end and design of God in the creation, is the happiness of the creature.

"God's ultimate end and design never can be finally frustrated or defeated; therefore all intelligent creatures shall finally be happy."

Here let the reader pause. Let him review this new scheme of religion and ascertain its leading features. He will find that what we call new now was called new a hundred years ago, and for the same reason. The doctrines were no more new then than they are at present; but it was a new thing that those doctrines should be avowed in the midst of orthodox churches. The reader cannot fail to notice, that every doctrine characteristic of the system which is now agitating the country, is embraced in the scheme which pious and orthodox men of New England were called to oppose during the last century. These doctrines are, 1. That the promotion of happiness is the grand end of creation. 2. That self-interest is the ultimate foundation of moral obligation. 3. That God cannot control the acts of moral agents, or prevent sin in a moral system. 4. That he cannot, of course, decree the acts of free agents. 5. That all sin consists in the voluntary transgression of known law; consequently that there is no such thing as a holy or unholy nature. Adam was not created holy, but formed his own moral character; and his posterity are not born corrupt, but become corrupt by their own voluntary transgression of known law. 6. That plenary

* "These call themselves Bibliarians."

ability and full power to the contrary are necessary to the morality of any act.

There are some points embraced in the new scheme as given by President Clap, which do not belong to the new divinity of our day; as, for example, the speculations about the divinity of Christ; and there are some which belong to the new divinity, as, for example, making regeneration to consist in the choice of God, as a source of happiness, or in a change of purpose, which are not expressly stated, though they are implied in the new scheme of the last century. It would be easy, and perhaps useful, to point out the striking coincidence, even in language, between these two schemes, did our limits permit.* We must content ourselves here with a very few illustrations. With regard to the first point, President Clap remarks, "This fundamental principle, 'That the happiness of the creature is the sole end of creation,' naturally leads to most if not all the rest." We are afraid this is too true, though many who adopt this principle, or at least the theory of virtue of which it is the expression, repudiate many or all of these consequences. It is a strange perversion to make happiness the end, and holiness but a means; as though enjoyment were superior to excellence. The theory that virtue is founded in utility; that a thing is right simply because of its tendency to promote happiness; this tendency being not merely the evidence of its excellence, but that excellence itself, is the copious fountain of speculative errors, and of perversion of the moral feelings. If happiness is the great end of creation; if any thing is right that promotes happiness, then the end sanctifies the means, and it is right to do evil that good may come. If it is right for God to act on this principle, it is hard to make men feel that it is wicked for them to do so. The only difficulty is, that they may not have knowledge enough to enable them to apply the principle correctly, but the principle itself must be good. We think it might easily be made to appear that the theology and morals of the church have suffered severely from the adoption of this false theory of virtue.

That this theory is a constituent part of the new divinity is plain from almost every page of the writings of the advocates of that system. "Why is righteousness or justice,"

* This is the less necessary, however, as our readers have access to the admirable letters on the origin and progress of the New Haven Theology, from a New England minister to one at the South; to Mr. Dow's pamphlet on the New Divinity, and to Mr. James Wood's work, entitled, *Old and New Theology*.

asks the Christian Spectator, "better than injustice?" After rejecting other answers, he says, "We must come back to the tendency to good or evil, pleasure or pain, happiness or unhappiness. The same relation is implied in saying, that righteousness or justice is better, or preferable to injustice or oppression. How better? In what respect preferable? What fitness or adaptedness has it, unless to good? and what is good, except as it tends to promote happiness?"* According to this doctrine there is no such thing as morality. Pleasure is the only good, and pain the only evil. There are means of pleasure, and causes of pain; but there is no such thing as sin or holiness. There is no specific difference between beauty and moral excellence; between a crime and a burn. There is, however, no more sense in asking, as is done by the Spectator, "How righteousness is better than injustice?" than in asking, how pleasure is better than pain? Every sentient being knows that pleasure is better than pain; and every moral being knows that righteousness is better than injustice. No reason need be given in either case. Right is as much a primary idea as pleasure. If a man had never felt pleasure it would be in vain to make him understand it; and if a man has no moral sense, he can have no conception of the meaning of the terms right and wrong. To tell him that right is the quality of any act which tends to produce happiness; and wrong of one which tends to produce pain, would make him think these words synonymous with expedient and inexpedient, agreeable and disagreeable. It would convey no idea of the specific meaning of the terms. Happiness is the mere shadow of virtue. It must always follow it. But virtue is no more defined, by saying that it is that which tends to produce happiness; than the nature of a solid body is defined by saying, it is that which casts a shadow.

People are very apt to imagine that they gain a victory, when they ask a question which does not admit of an answer. This is a great mistake. We are no more concerned because we cannot tell an inquirer what there is in virtue besides its tendency to produce happiness, than we are because we cannot tell a deaf man the difference between a loud sound and a bright colour. The difficulty does not arise from the identity of the two things, but from a want of capacity in the questioner to perceive the difference. Such interrogations,

* *Christian Spectator*, vol. 10, p. 538.

therefore, as those of the Spectator, produce in us no other feeling than that of wonder how they can be put by any man with a moral sense.

But the plague-spot of the new divinity is the second point above specified, the principle that self-interest is the ultimate foundation of moral obligation. This is its point of alliance with the lowest form of speculative opinions on this subject, and which gives it a character which must degrade the moral and religious feelings of every human breast in which it gains a lodgement. This offensive doctrine is not only incidentally stated, or indirectly implied, it is formally propounded and vindicated in writings of recognised authority in reference to the new divinity. Thus we are told, "This self-love or desire of happiness is the primary cause or reason of all acts of preference or choice, which fix supremely on any object." And more plainly still, "Of all specific, voluntary action the happiness of the agent, in some form, is the *ultimate end*."* Can there be a human heart which does not revolt at such a monstrous assertion? Has every act of piety, every deed of benevolence, every attention of maternal love, the happiness of the agent as its ultimate end? The assertion contradicts the consciousness of every human being. All religion, all benevolence, all the social affections do not centre in self. Any man whose own happiness is the ultimate end of all his specific voluntary actions, is a bad man. If such a being could be found, he would not deserve the name of a man. Every one performs a multitude of acts because they are right; and in which the happiness of others and not of himself is the ultimate end. It may be said, we do not analyse our feelings with sufficient accuracy. We have, however, no faith in this analysing one thing into another; a sense of right into a desire of happiness; self-denial into self-seeking; the love of God into the love of self. We pray to be delivered from all such metaphysics.

Lest our readers should think that we assume, on too slight grounds, that this doctrine is a part of the new scheme of religion of our days, we refer them to an article on moral obligation in the last number of the Christian Spectator. They will find it there taught that "the ultimate foundation of moral obligation is the tendency of an action to promote the highest happiness of an agent, by promoting the highest welfare of all," p. 531. The last clause of the sen-

* Christian Spectator, 1829. p. 21, 24.

tence has nothing to do with the doctrine. The ground of obligation is the tendency of the act to promote the happiness of the agent. The fact that his happiness is best secured by acts which tend to promote the highest welfare of all, is not, according to the theory, the reason of their being obligatory. And this the article teaches with abundant plainness. The nature of the doctrine taught is clear from the whole drift of the piece; and will be sufficiently indicated to the reader by such sentences as the following, "It will perhaps be said, that by making moral obligation to rest on the tendency to promote the highest happiness of the agent, we make it wholly a *selfish* thing," p. 541. "Perhaps it may here be said, if this is the evil of sin—the disregard of the agent's highest welfare—and if this often times results from a state of ignorance, then the only remedy necessary is to supply the requisite knowledge—to enlighten the mind," p. 550. It is taught no less explicitly that the primary reason why we are bound to obey God is, that he knows best what will make us happy. Nay, we are told that it has been said, by at least one advocate of the new divinity, that if the devil could make him happier than God can, he would serve the devil.* It is hard to conceive how he could serve the devil more effectually than by making such declarations, which, after all, are only an irreverent statement of the doctrine of the Christian Spectator. On p. 529, the question is started, Why ought we to obey the will of God? After a good deal of circumlocution, it comes out that this obligation rests on his wisdom and benevolence, that is, upon his knowing what will render us most happy, and upon the assurance which his benevolence affords, that he will not deceive us as to this point. "The rule," we are told, exists, "and what its foundation is we have seen. As a matter of fact, it exists, however it may be made known, and the tendency, or bearing, or relation to happiness, whence it arises would exist, even if the rule or law was unknown. It is the province of the moral governor to make this truth known and to sustain it. The fact that he is such a being, that he is competent to the task, forms a reason, why he should be obeyed. In this competency, his capacity to judge what is best, what is most productive of good or of happiness, and his disposition to do it, in other words his infinite wisdom and benevolence, is the prime element to be taken into

* We would not state this on slight grounds. We have received it from a source on which entire reliance may be placed.

the account," p. 537. On a previous page it was said, that if there was "no feeling of gratification in the act (of obedience to God) the force of obligation would be unfelt." And on 538, it is asked, "On what ground is obedience claimed? It is that the law is holy, just, and *good*. The very reason that God assigns is, that it is *good*, that it is the surest way of making us most happy. [The words *holy*, and *just*, it seems, have no meaning for this writer.] His declaration in the form of law, is the highest evidence which we have of the fact, for it is the testimony of one who sees in all things the end from the beginning, and who has no disposition to mislead us, but who with all the sincerity of infinite love, seeks to promote our highest happiness. Men do not distinguish between God's competency to discern and to make known to us the way of happiness, and his creating a particular line of conduct right or wrong." Again, "Does any one hold that the will of God is the foundation of moral obligation, we show, that this, when carefully examined, can mean nothing more than the objective ground, or the indication or proof to us, wherein our true welfare lies, so as to supply to us our defect of knowledge," p. 543. According to this doctrine there is in fact no such thing as moral obligation in the universe. A man is bound to promote his own happiness in the best way he can, and this is his whole duty. All his obligation is to himself. He owes nothing to God, or to his fellow men. It is expedient for him to observe the divine directions, but he is bound to do so, only so far as they promote his own welfare. We would fain hope that such a doctrine needs no refutation in a Christian country. Its naked statement is enough to secure its reprobation.

The third specification given above is, That God cannot control the acts of free agents, or that he could not prevent the introduction of sin into a moral system. "It is a groundless assumption," says Dr. Taylor, "that God could have prevented all sin, or at least the present degree of sin in a moral system. . . . Would not a benevolent God, had it been possible to him in the nature of things, have secured the existence of universal holiness in his moral kingdom."* "Free moral agents," says the Christian Spectator, "can do wrong under every possible influence to prevent it."† "God not only prefers on the whole, that his creatures should forever perform their duties rather than neglect them, but pro-

* Concio. p. 28.

† Vol. 1830, p. 563.

poses on his part to do all in his power to promote this very object.”* God, it is said, determined on his present course of providence, “not for the sake of redemption in the universe, rather than have a universe without sin; but for introducing redemption into a universe from which sin could not, by any providence, be excluded.”† “The nature of things, as they now exist, forbids, as far as God himself is concerned, the more frequent existence of holiness in the place of sin.”‡ “The prevention of sin did not enter into his determination because he saw it to be impracticable,” p. 15. “It is to him a subject of regret and grief, yet men transgress; they rebel in spite of his wishes; they persevere in sin in spite of all which he can do to reclaim them,” p. 19.

Fourth, that the assumption that God cannot effectually control the acts of moral agents, is inconsistent with the doctrine of decrees, is too evident to need remark. The doctrine is therefore rejected, though the terms, for the sake of convenience, or for some other reason, are retained. That God decrees that an event should occur, and yet “proposes to do all in his power” to prevent its occurrence no one can believe. It may permit its occurrence, or submit to it rather than destroy the system, but to say that he decrees it, appears to be a contradiction. The statement of the doctrines of predestination and election given by the New Haven writers and others of the same school, is in accordance with this fundamental principle of their system, and is a virtual denial of those doctrines. “Whatever degree or kind of influence,” says the *Spectator*, “is used with them (sinners) to favour their return to him, at any given time, is as strongly favourable to their conversion as it can be made amid the obstacles which a world of guilty and rebellious moral agents opposed to God’s works of grace.”§ In another place, the writer, speaking of the influence which operates on the sinner, says, “Election involves nothing more, as it respects his individual case, except one fact—the certainty to the divine mind, whether the sinner will yield to the means of grace, and voluntarily turn to God, or whether he will continue to harden his heart until the means of grace are withdrawn.” That is, God exerts an influence on sinners as strongly favourable to their conversion “as it can be made,” and he knows who will

* *Ch. Spect.* 1832, p. 660.

† *Ch. Spect.* p. 635.

‡ Sermon by Edward R. Tyler, New Haven, 1829, p. 9.

§ See Review of Dr. Fiske’s Sermon on Predestination and Election.

yield, and this is election! To the same effect Mr. Tyler teaches "God foresees whom he *can* make willing in the day of his power, and resolves that they shall be saved," p. 14. And Mr. Finney, "The elect were chosen to eternal life, because God foresaw that in the perfect exercise of their freedom they could be induced to repent and embrace the gospel."* It is really surprising that the New Haven divines should still assert that they hold the doctrines of predestination and election in the ordinary sense of the terms. President Fiske, in answer to the review of his sermon in the *Christian Spectator*, justly complains of this unfairness. "I cannot," he says, "but express my deepest regret that a gentleman of the reviewer's standing and learning should lend his aid, and give his sanction to such a perversion of language, to such a confusion of tongues. Do the words predestinate, foreordain, decree, mean in their radical and critical definition, nothing more than to permit, not absolutely to hinder, to submit to as an unavoidable and offensive evil? . . . Why then should the reviewer, believing as he does, continue to use them in the symbols of his faith? . . . His mode of explanation turns the doctrine into Arminianism."

Fifth, that all sin consists in the voluntary transgression of known law. This is so much a favourite topic with the writers of this class, that it is hardly necessary to bring examples. As they explain and apply the principle, it involves the denial both of original righteousness and original sin. "Neither a holy nor a depraved nature is possible," says Dr. Beecher, "without understanding, conscience and choice. To say of an accountable creature that he is depraved by nature, is only to say, that rendered capable by his Maker of obedience, he disobeys from the commencement of his accountability."† "It is obvious," says Mr. Duffield, "that in infancy and incipient childhood, when none of the actions are deliberate, or the result of motive, operating in connexion with the knowledge of law, and of the great end of human actions, no moral character can appropriately be predicated."‡ "Why then is it necessary," asks the *Christian Spectator*, "to suppose some distinct evil propensity, some fountain of iniquity in the breast of the child previous to moral action?"§ "Animals and infants previous to moral agency, do therefore stand on precisely the same ground in

* Sermons on Important Subjects, p. 25.

† Sermon on the Native Character of Man.

‡ Regeneration, p. 378. § *Christian Spectator*, 1829, p. 367.

reference to this subject." The doctrine of "a native propensity to evil," according to Dr. Taylor, makes "God the responsible author of sin," destroys responsibility, &c. &c. See his Review of Dr. Tyler in the *Christian Spectator*, 1832. It is useless to multiply quotations.

Sixth, that plenary ability and full power to the contrary are necessary to the morality of any act. There are three views of the doctrine of ability. The old one is, "That man by his fall into a state of sin hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that which is good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare him thereunto." Inasmuch as the inability here spoken of is very different from that under which a man lies to create a world, and inasmuch as it results from sin or the moral state of the agent, it may properly be called moral. On the other hand, as fallen man is a free moral agent, as the things to be done do not transcend his nature as a man, there is a sense in which he may be said to have a natural ability to obey all the commands of God. So long as the expression natural ability was used in this sense, there was no controversy as to the thing, but only as to the propriety of the terms. There are two prominent objections to this form of expression. The one is the perpetual and puzzling contradictions in which it involves the preachers of the gospel; who tell sinners in the same breath, they can and they cannot; as well as the incongruity of saying that a man is able to do what it is admitted that, in another and equally true and important sense, he is unable to do. It is always an evil to have the declarations of ministers come into conflict with the consciousness of their hearers. A man may, metaphysically speaking, be said to have a natural ability to love one person as well as another, yet to tell him, he *can* love all persons alike, he feels to be absurd. The other objection is, that this form of expression is unscriptural. It is not worth while for us to be more philosophical or accurate than the Bible. The word of God never tells the sinner he can do all that God requires of him, though it often presses on him his obligation. They know but little of the human heart, who so confidently maintain that a sense of obligation is incompatible with the deepest conviction of helplessness and inability.

The second view of this doctrine is the Arminian. It does not differ from the preceding except in one point. It admits that men have by the fall lost all ability of will to

that which is spiritually good, but it teaches that the common influences of the Spirit, given to all men who hear the gospel, imparts sufficient strength for the performance of all duty.

The third view is that which may, with propriety and therefore without offence, be called Pelagian. It is that which President Edwards attributes to Dr. Taylor of Norwich, viz. that there is "a sufficient power and ability in all mankind to do all their duty, and wholly avoid sin;" or, that "God has given powers equal to the duties which he expects." If this is so, says Edwards, "redemption is needless, and Christ is dead in vain."* This is the doctrine of the New Divinity. "What notion," asks the Christian Spectator, "can be formed of a subject of moral government, who is destitute of moral liberty? or, in other words, who, in every instance of obedience and disobedience, does not act with inherent power to the contrary choice."† "Choice, in its very nature," says Dr. Beecher, "implies the possibility of a different or contrary election to that which is made." Again, "The question is not whether man chooses, that is notorious, but whether his choice is free as opposed to a fatal necessity." (The reader will perceive that these two sentences contradict each other). "If a man does not possess the power of choice, with power to the contrary, he sees and feels he is not to blame."‡ The New Haven gentlemen constantly represent what has hitherto been represented as moral inability as inconsistent with free agency. Dr. Tyler had stated that there was in man "a native propensity to evil." His reviewer replies "With such a propensity, man has not a natural ability to avoid sin. And this is alike true, whether this propensity be supposed to be sinful or innocent." In like manner, because Dr. Tyler maintained that there was a moral change in the sinner anterior to right moral action, he is represented as teaching physical depravity, physical regeneration, natural inability, &c. &c.§ "Talk not," says the Spectator, "of the distinction of natural and moral ability, you have done it forever away. If the change in question consists in any thing prior to voluntary exercise, such a change I can in no sense produce."||

* Edwards' Works, Vol. 2, 515.

† Spectator 1835, p. 377.

‡ Views in Theology, p. 32. *et passim*.

§ Christian Spectator, 1832, Review of Dr. Tyler.

|| Spectator, 1833, p. 661. See a full discussion of the theory of free agency on which all these representations are founded, in our Number for July 1837.

It is therefore abundantly manifest that the New Divinity is, in its essential features, identical with the 'New Scheme of Religion' with which the pious people of Connecticut had to contend a century ago. If it was right for them to oppose it, it is right it should be opposed now. It was the friends of evangelical religion who resisted the introduction of the New Scheme; and it is the friends of religion who now oppose the New Divinity. The history of the church may be challenged to produce a single case in which true religion, we do not say has flourished, but has survived under the operation of that system of doctrine. It has been called Arminianism. But this is a great mistake. There is four-fold more truth and aliment for piety in Arminianism than in these new doctrines. Far more truth in the Arminian doctrine of original sin, of divine influence, of regeneration, of the atonement, of justification. And what has Arminianism to do with the doctrine that all virtue is founded in utility? (So too we suppose all beauty is founded in utility, and the only reason that a cascade gives pleasure is that it is adapted to turn a grist mill). And more especially, what has Arminianism to do with the monstrous doctrine that self-love is the ultimate foundation of moral obligation? The churches ought not to be deceived upon this subject. The New Divinity is not Arminianism, but something far, very far worse. Those men are to be pitied who can see nothing but a *shade* of difference between this system and the common orthodoxy of evangelical churches; and still more are they to be commiserated who, for party purposes, or for any other reason, call that a shade, which they know to be a bottomless abyss. It remains yet to be seen whether the faith and spirit of the Puritans have still sufficient vigour in New England effectually to withstand the progress of this system. It has received, we trust, its death blow in the Presbyterian church.

We resume our extracts from President Clap's Defence.

"The reading of this new scheme of religion will doubtless differently affect the minds of different readers: some will be filled with indignation, to see the great and fundamental doctrines of the gospel thus subverted and denied: others will think it scarce possible, that any men of sense should run into such absurd notions: others who have been inconsiderately led into some of the principles, will start, when they come to see how naturally they lead to some other of these principles, which at present they abhor. For this funda-

mental principle, 'that the happiness of the creature is the sole end of the creation,' naturally leads to most, if not all of the rest: for this must be the sole rule and measure of all God's conduct towards us, and of ours towards him; and it is certain, that God's sole end and ultimate design never can be frustrated. Others will be grieved and provoked, to see their whole scheme exposed to open view; since they find it most politic to conceal some parts of it, till they can get the minds of men pretty well rivetted into the rest.

"In order therefore, to bring men to an indifferency, and prepare them by degrees for the reception of this new scheme, sundry artifices have been used.

"That there ought to be no creeds or confessions of faith but the Bible: that there are no fundamental principles in religion, or any certain set of doctrines necessary to be believed, in order to salvation: that those which have been commonly esteemed such, are but mere disputable speculative points, which have no influence upon practice: and that the greatest heresy is an immoral life: that public orthodoxy has been very various in different countries; and in the same country at different times; that councils and assemblies of divines not being infallible, have no right to make or impose upon others, any creeds or confessions of faith, or public tests, or standards of orthodoxy; or to fix any particular sense or meaning on the Scripture: that no man is bound to believe as our fathers believed; but every man has a right to judge for himself; and that is truth to every man which he believes to be the truth: that every man shall be saved in that way or religion which he thinks is right, let it be what it will; provided he lives according to it: that it is sufficient, if men say, that they consent to the substance of our catechism and confession, without rigourously insisting upon every article and doctrine in it: that great condescension ought to be used, and sundry doctrines ought to be given up, either in whole or in part, or different explications allowed for the sake of unity.

"That no man ought to be so uncharitable; as to exclude another from salvation, or any public office of instruction, because he does not think as he does: that men's way of thinking is as different as their faces; and to endeavour to make all men think alike, is to make them bigots, and hinder all free enquiry after truth."

That is, the 'artifices' employed in President Clap's time to favour the introduction of error, were, 1. Undervaluing creeds and confessions, and subscribing them, for substance

of doctrine. 2. Making light of the points of difference, as mere philosophy, or matters of speculation, or modes of explanation. 3. Declaiming on the sin of destroying the unity of the church for the sake of doctrine; on the duty of charity towards errorists; on the right of free enquiry; and 4. Concealing the truth, as he says, p. 42: "Men of this character are not always open and frank in declaring their sentiments." Such it seems were the devices employed by the advocates of the New Scheme of religion a hundred years ago. Cannot the reader, without our aid, furnish modern illustrations in abundance under each of these heads? Our limits do not admit of our doing it for him, and the facts are so notorious, it can hardly be necessary. It is a standing topic of declamation, the folly of expecting men, who think for themselves, to join in adopting an extended creed. If the substance be adopted, that is all that can be required. And the substance is often a very small part of what is really characteristic of the formula. Is it not also a common method in our days of introducing the New Divinity, to make much of the distinction between the doctrines and the philosophy of them? to claim to hold the doctrines and differ only in the explanation, as even John Taylor professed to hold to original sin, with a new explanation? How much too have we heard of the sin of heresy hunting, of producing disturbance in the church, and of the duty of living in peace let men teach what they may? Who, however, is chargeable with the sin of controversy? the innovators, or those who defend the faith once delivered to the saints? Is there no sin in attacking brethren, who hold the faith of the very standards which the aggressors have adopted, and great sin in asserting what both parties have professed to believe? How true it is what the famous Mr. Foxcroft of Boston, remarked of his generation, "that false moderation, which sacrifices divine revelations to human friendships, and under colour of peace and candour gives up important points of gospel doctrine to every opposer, is still consistent with discovering a malignity towards others that appear warm defenders and constant asserters of those evangelical truths."*

The grand device, however, of errorist in every age, has been concealment. They do not come out boldly and frankly with their true sentiments, but endeavour to introduce

* Preface to President Dickinson's Second Vindication of God's Sovereign Grace. Boston, 1748.

them gradually as the public mind will bear them. The reader will probably remember that when the doctrine was first, in these days, broached that God could not prevent sin in a moral system, how delicately it was insinuated; it was merely said that the contrary could not be proved, or ought not to be assumed; the idea was thrown out as a hypothesis for further consideration. It may also be within the knowledge of the reader how virtuously indignant the *Spectator* was with Dr. Woods because he "changed Dr. Taylor's question into an assertion—his hypothetical statement into a positive affirmation."* Since that time, however, the doctrine has been asserted interrogatively and affirmatively; categorically and inferentially. It has been assumed as the basis of argument; the denial of it has been made the fountain of all manner of heresy and blasphemies. Notwithstanding all this, the simple hypothesis is still resorted to in times of peculiar emergency.

Another favourite method of concealment adopted in past ages was the introduction of new opinions under the patronage of revered names. This may remind the reader of the numerous attempts to make Edwards, Bellamy, Dwight, and others, teach the very doctrines which they strenuously opposed, in order to gain the sanction of their names for the errors which they endeavoured to refute. And, finally, as we must stop somewhere, another method of concealment is the use of ambiguous terms, or the introduction of errors under the old formulas of expression, employed in a new sense. Can any thing be more seemingly orthodox than the phrase 'total depravity by nature?' How little it seems to differ from natural depravity, or depravity of nature. Yet they are, as to the sense intended, the poles apart. God is said to foreordain whatsoever comes to pass. What Calvinist could desire more? Yet to foreordain turns out to mean, as it regards sin at least, to submit to its occurrence as an unavoidable evil, and to propose to do all in the power of Him who foreordains it, to prevent that occurrence. Original sin used to mean, in the language of President Edwards, "an innate sinful depravity of heart." The term is still retained by those who teach with the *New Haven Spectator*, Mr. Duffield, and others, that infants have no moral character. Prof. Fitch says "Nothing can in truth be called original sin, but his first moral choice or preference being evil." Mr.

* *Spectator*, 1830, p. 541.

Duffield says, indeed, "original sin is a natural bias to evil."* Here to the uninitiated it would appear that two things are asserted, first that this bias to evil is sin; and second, that it is natural. But no such thing. This same Mr. Duffield says, "Instinct, animal sensation, constitutional susceptibilities create an impulse, which, not being counteracted by moral considerations or gracious influence, lead the will in a wrong direction and to wrong objects. It was thus that sin was induced in our holy progenitors. No one can plead in Eve an efficient cause of sin resident in her nature (any *prava vis*) or operative power, sinful in itself, anterior to and apart from her own voluntary act. And if she was led into sin, though characteristically holy, and destitute of any innate propensity to sin, where is the necessity for supposing that the sins of her progeny are to be referred to such a cause?" . . . "Temptation alone is sufficient under present circumstances."† Thus after all it appears that this "natural bias to evil" is nothing more than the constitutional susceptibilities of our nature, such as it existed before the fall, yet this bias is said to be SIN. Rather than not be orthodox and hold to original sin, he makes it exist in our "holy progenitors" before the first transgression! Can this be exceeded in the whole history of theological diplomacy? Yet it is a fair interpretation of the language of the Protest, as explained by the writings of some of its authors.

We wish it were in our power to insert the whole of President Clap's pamphlet; but we have already much exceeded the limits assigned for this article. We must therefore conclude with a few citations given without remark.

"The doctrines contained in our Catechism and Confession of Faith, particularly the divinity and satisfaction of Christ, original sin, the necessity of special grace in regeneration, justification by faith, &c. have been universally received, established and taught in all ages of the Christian church: and upon all the search I have been able to make into antiquity, I can find no single instance of any public Confession of Faith, drawn up by any council, or generally received and establish-

* Minutes for the General Assembly for 1837. Protest by George Duffield, E. W. Gilbert and others against the adoption of the report on so much of the memorial of the Convention as relates to erroneous doctrines. The statement of doctrines contained in that Protest, as explained by the writings of its leading signers, is the most extraordinary example of the use of old terms in a sense directly opposite to their ordinary meaning, which we have ever seen.

† Duffield on Regeneration p. 379, 380

ed in any Christian country in the world, wherein any of these doctrines have been plainly and expressly denied.

“For though there have been some men scattered up and down in the world, and sometimes convened in assemblies, who have not believed these doctrines, and have sometimes endeavoured covertly to disguise them, and let them drop, and, by degrees, to root them out of the Christian church; yet they never dared openly and formally to deny them, by any public act; because they knew that these doctrines had been so universally received in the Christian church, that all antiquity would condemn them, and that such an open denial would bring upon them the resentment of all mankind.”

On page thirty-seven we find the following passage, “Some will say, that they own the doctrine of original sin; but they mean nothing but a contracted disposition or inclination, arising from a vicious habit, or practice, and deny that any disposition or inclination to sin, is naturally derived from Adam: and assert, that every child comes into the world like a clean white piece of paper.

“Mr. Taylor calls the doctrine of original sin, a scripture doctrine; and yet when he comes to explain it, with regard to Adam’s posterity, he makes it no sin at all; and allows nothing but that, upon the sin of Adam, God subjected him and his posterity to temporal sorrow, labour and death.* And these are not punishments for sin, but primarily designed for the benefit of mankind, considered as innocent creatures. For, he says that upon the occasion of Adam’s sin, God appointed our life frail, laborious and sorrowful, and at length to be concluded by death, not to punish us for another man’s sin, but to lessen temptation.†

“And therefore, I cannot think that public orthodoxy in teachers, can be sufficiently secured barely by men’s saying, that they consent to the substance of our catechism and confession of faith, and differ only in some small circumstantial, leaving it to them to judge what those small circumstantial are: for a man may suppose or pretend, that the ten commandments are the most substantial part of the catechism, and that the doctrines of the divinity and satisfaction of Christ, original sin, &c. are but mere speculative circumstantial points, upon which no great weight ought to be laid. Such persons ought at least to declare, what particular articles

* “Page 63.”

† “Page 68.”

they do except, that so others may judge whether they are mere circumstantials or not.

“But then it is difficult, if not dangerous, to give up any one proper doctrine or article of faith, contained in our confession: for all the articles of faith in a system or body of divinity, have a necessary relation to, and connection with each other; whoever therefore gives up any one article of faith, must, if he is consistent with himself, give up another which has a necessary connection with it, or dependence upon it; and so on, till he gives up the whole. Indeed, some men seem to be partly in one scheme of religion, and partly in another; but such men are always inconsistent with themselves; although for want of accurately tracing their own ideas, they are not always sensible of it.

“Some men will pretend to consent to an article of faith, and yet believe nothing of it, in the true grammatical construction of the words, and the meaning of the composers. e. g. Some who pretend to consent to the thirty-nine articles; by original sin, and the corruption of humane nature, mean nothing but bodily weakness and sickness; and by its deserving God's wrath and damnation, mean nothing but bodily sickness and pain, and the temporal miseries of this life.

“So the meaning of that article, according to them, is, that Adam's sin is the occasion of our undergoing bodily sickness and weakness, which deserves bodily sickness and pain.

“Condescension, charity and unity, are very excellent things, when applied to promote the ends of the gospel; and therefore, it is a pity they should upon any occasion be perverted to destroy it.

“But condescension has no more to do with articles of faith, than with propositions in the mathematics. And though a man ought in many cases to give up his own right or interest; yet he cannot in any case give up the truth of God, revealed in his word.

“Charity is but another name for love, and the consequent effects of it, in believing or hoping the best concerning any man, which the nature of the case will allow; and considering how apt corrupt nature is to intermix self-interest, passion and prejudice, with matters of religion, it is a virtue which, in that view, ought to be much insisted upon: but charity no more consists in inventing or believing new terms of salvation, unknown to the gospel, than it does in believing a sick man will recover, when the symptoms of death are evidently upon him. Such charity as that, is the greatest

uncharitableness, as it tends to lull men in security to their eternal destruction.

“Unity in a joint-declared consent to the great and fundamental principles of religion, and practice of the duties of it, is a matter of great importance; but without such a consent, unity is founded upon nothing; and can never answer any of the great ends proposed in the gospel. Men must be agreed at least in the object of their worship, whether it be the eternal self-existent God, or a mere creature: and in order to maintain this unity in the Christian church, there always have been public creeds and confessions of faith, (all agreeing in substance) to which all, especially the teachers, have given their joint consent.

“Neither can those who adhere to the ancient doctrines of the Christian church, be properly called a party: that odious name properly belongs to each of those particular sects, which, from time to time, oppose those doctrines and thereby make themselves a party.

“The Bible is indeed the only foundation of our Christian faith; and all the question is, in what sense we are to understand it: but so far as any regard is to be had to the judgment of great and good men, in expounding of it, (and I think it is an argument of great self-sufficiency, if not self-conceit, to have none at all,) yet the number and quality of those who have at any time opposed these doctrines, bear no comparison to the vast number of martyrs, and other eminently wise and good men, who have constantly maintained them. And the opinion of Arius, Pelagius, Socinus, Arminius, Foster, Chubb, Taylor, and all their followers, are but as the small dust of the balance, when put into the scale against the opinion of the whole Christian church in all ages.

“But I am free, that every man should examine for himself, and then openly declare what he finds.

“For my part, I have critically and carefully, and, I think, with the utmost impartiality, examined into the doctrines contained in our catechism and confession of faith, and believe they are fully and plainly contained in the sacred oracles of truth, perfectly agreeable to reason, and harmonious with each other; and that most of them are of the utmost consequence to the salvation of the souls of men. And therefore look upon myself in duty bound, to do all that lies in my power, to continue and propagate those doctrines; especially in the college committed to my care, since that is the fountain from whence our churches must be supplied.

“ And I hope, that all the ministers of this colony, according to the recommendation of former synods, and later general associations, will be careful and zealous to maintain and propagate the same in all our churches: that they will clearly and plainly preach all the doctrines contained in the sacred oracles of truth, and especially the more important of them, summed up in our catechism and confession of faith; that they will not endeavour to conceal or disguise any of these doctrines, nor shun to declare the whole counsel of God. That they will be careful not to introduce into the sacred ministry, any but such as appear to be well-fixed in these principles upon which our churches are established. It is a pleasure to me, to observe, that no person who has lately been licensed to preach as a candidate, lies under any suspicion of that nature.”

ART. IV.—*Sermons by the late Rev. Edward D. Griffin, D.D. To which is prefaced a Memoir of his life.* By William B. Sprague, D.D. Minister of the second Presbyterian Congregation in Albany. 2 Vols. 8vo. pp. 597, and 596. Albany: Packard & Van Benthuysen & Co. 1838.

THIS publication has been for some time looked for by the religious community with no small interest. It was known, early in the last year, that the Rev. Dr. Sprague had been selected by the family and friends of the late Dr. Griffin to prepare a memoir of his life, and to arrange and publish a portion of those Discourses which, from the lips of their venerable author, had so often made a solemn impression. The choice was a happy one. Dr. Sprague was well acquainted with the subject of his biographical sketch, and well qualified to do justice to his undertaking: and he has accomplished his task in a manner which we think will not disappoint the expectations of the public. The Rev. Edward Dorr Griffin, was a native of the state of Connecticut. He was born at East Haddam, January 6, 1770. His father, George Griffin was a wealthy farmer, of vigorous talents, and of much enterprise. His mother was Eve Dorr of Lyme. He was named after his fraternal uncle, the Rev. Edward Dorr, of Hartford; and in the intention of his parents, was devoted to the minis-

try from his birth. As his health, in early youth, was very delicate, he was kept almost constantly at school up to the time of his entering College. His preparatory studies were chiefly conducted by the Rev. Joseph Vail, of Hadlyme. In September, 1786 he became a member of Yale College. In his course in that Institution he seems to have been very honourably distinguished, and was graduated in 1790.

The religious impressions of the subject of this memoir seem to have begun at an early age. They do not appear, however, to have ripened into genuine piety until more than a year after he left college, and while he was engaged as the principal of an Academy at Derby, a town about ten miles west of New Haven. His plan, anterior to this, had been to study law, with a view to rising at the bar. But after recovering from a severe fit of sickness in 1791, his mind was drawn more forcibly than ever to the great interests of eternity. Soon after this he commenced his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Edwards, then Pastor of a church in New Haven, and afterwards President of Union College. On the 31st of October, 1792, he was licensed to preach by the West Association of New Haven county, and on the tenth of the following month his first sermon was preached in the pulpit of his venerated friend, the Rev. Mr. Vail, under whose instruction he had been prepared for College.

In the course of the two following years he laboured in several vacant churches, with much acceptance, and, apparently, to the spiritual benefit of many individuals. On the 4th of June, 1795, he was ordained to the work of the ministry, and installed pastor of the Congregational church in New Hartford, Connecticut, after having preached to that church for several preceding months as a candidate for settlement. On the 17th of May, 1796, he was married to Miss Francis Huntington, daughter of the Rev. Dr. Joseph Huntington, of Coventry, and niece and adopted daughter of the Hon. Samuel Huntington, Governor of Connecticut, and one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. With this lady he lived in happy union until within a few weeks of his death.

Mr. Griffin's ministry at New Hartford was eminently successful. Almost immediately after he commenced his labours in this church, there was an increased attention to religion among the people of his charge, and a revival of considerable power succeeded, which resulted in the addition of

about fifty persons to the communion of the church. Again in 1798 another revival commenced, of much greater power and extent, which issued in a still larger addition to the professing people of God.

Mr. Griffin remained in New Hartford about five years. While his ministry continued to be richly blessed, and he was enjoying in a high degree the confidence and affection of his people, the health of Mrs. Griffin became delicate, and she was advised by her physicians to make choice of a milder climate. In consequence of this advice Mr. Griffin presented to his congregation the alternative of either withdrawing from his labours and relinquishing his salary till there should be time to make the necessary experiment on Mrs. Griffin's health; or of immediately resigning his pastoral charge. His congregation preferred the temporary suspension of his labours, rather than the relinquishment of his relation to them. Accordingly, in the month of October, 1800, he left New Hartford, and travelled into East Jersey:—and having received an invitation from a friend and brother in the ministry to spend some time with him, he complied with his friendly request and remained a number of weeks under his hospitable roof. During the autumn and winter which he spent in this part of New Jersey, he preached abundantly in a number of churches and always with a high degree of acceptance. The greater part of this time, however, was employed in preaching to the First Presbyterian Church of Orange, near Newark, which had recently become vacant. Here his ministry was blessed to the hopeful conversion of about fifty souls; and the congregation would probably have given him a unanimous call, had he not discouraged it, on the ground that if the health of Mrs. Griffin would permit him to remain at New Hartford, he could not consent, in present circumstances, to sever his connection with that church. Accordingly in the following June, he returned to his pastoral charge, with his wife, and an infant daughter, born during his sojourn in New Jersey.

In the meanwhile, the congregation of Newark, having had repeated opportunities of having Mr. Griffin preach during his temporary abode in their neighbourhood, gave him an affectionate call to be a colleague with their aged and venerable pastor, Dr. M'Whorter. This call he thought it his duty to accept. His pastoral relation to the church at New Hartford was dissolved in the month of August. He soon afterwards returned with his family to Newark, and

was installed as co-pastor in that church on the 20th of October, 1801.

Here was a field well adapted both for the usefulness and comfort of such a man as the subject of this memoir. He could scarcely have found a population more enlightened, liberal and affectionate than that of Newark; and his popular and commanding talents were eminently adapted, not only to gratify, but to adorn and build up such a people.

Mr. Griffin remained nearly eight years in Newark; and here again his ministry was crowned with rich and repeated blessings. Several remarkable seasons of refreshing were granted to him and his people; but two were of special extent and power. In the first of these seasons one hundred and thirteen persons were added to his church in the course of one year; and in the second, one hundred and seventy-four in six months. In fact the number of his church members was more than doubled during his residence with them.

In the month of August 1808, the last year of his first residence in Newark, the degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon him by the Trustees of Union College. He was now in the thirty ninth year of his age.

In the course of the year 1808, Dr. Griffin was appointed Bartlett Professor of Pulpit Eloquence in the Theological Seminary at Andover. This appointment, after serious deliberation, he was induced to accept. Several months, however, elapsed before he could obtain the dissolution of his pastoral charge at Newark, from which he found it extremely difficult to tear himself away. His dismissal was not obtained until the month of April, in the following year. On the 28th of May he preached his farewell sermon to the beloved flock, to which he had borne a relation so tender, and so productive of precious results;—and on the next day set out with his family for Andover. His induction into the office of Professor in the Theological Seminary, to which he had been called, took place on the 21st of June following.

About the same time that the Seminary at Andover was established, the friends of Gospel truth in Boston engaged in the enterprize of founding an Orthodox church in that city, which might prove the commencement of a plan for resisting the Unitarianism, and restoring the doctrinal and Christian correctness of that ancient seat of the puritan fathers. Soon after Dr. Griffin was established in his Professorship at Andover, this enterprize was carried into effect and the well known church in Park street was erected. And as his pop-

ularity as a preacher in Boston and its vicinity was very great, the leaders of the undertaking considered it as a matter of great importance to their success to enjoy his countenance and aid. They even thought in the outset, of detaching him from the Seminary, and calling him to be their pastor. This, however, he resisted promptly, and with so much firmness that the idea was for a time abandoned. Feeling that their success depended, humanly speaking, on their being able to obtain a preacher of great popularity and weight of character,—they called two gentlemen in succession of acknowledged eminence. Both these calls, however, were rejected. At length, after having been kept more than a year and a half, from the date of their organization, in a state of alternate suspense and disappointment, they recurred again to the thought of calling Dr. Griffin; and presented the importance and exigency of their cause in so strong a point of light, and with so much importunity, that he was, at length, prevailed upon to resign his Professorship at Andover, and accept the pastoral charge of the Park Street Church. Accordingly he removed to Boston in May, 1811, and the solemnity of his installation took place on the 31st day of the following June.

Dr. Griffin continued to be the Pastor of the Park Street Church between three and four years. During this time, he was diligent, eloquent, and popular, both as a Preacher and Pastor. During this period, too, he delivered and published his "Park Street Lectures," which have generally been considered as the ablest of all his publications. And no one acquainted with the consistency and uniformity of his character can doubt that he preached now with an ardour and a power as great as ever before. And yet, if we mistake not, Dr. Griffin's ministry in Boston was not attended with any thing like the success with which it pleased God to connect it in every preceding and subsequent stage of his pastoral life. We know not whether we are justifiable in attempting to account for this fact—supposing it to be a fact;—but we will venture to make one suggestion which our readers may regard as little or as much as they think proper.

We are constrained, then, seriously to doubt, whether the enterprize of those public-spirited and excellent men who undertook the creation of the "Park Street Church," was not undertaken and conducted in a spirit of a very questionable character. We have no doubt that they were pious and sincere men, who really believed as they professed to believe, who were filled with a laudable zeal, and who honestly aimed

to oppose error, and to promote the reign of truth and righteousness. But what we doubt is, whether they did not calculate too much on carrying their point by means of outward splendor and human eloquence. They felt that there were great learning, and wealth, and taste, and eloquence firmly intrenched in Boston, and to be met and opposed by the friends of truth. And the calculation seems to have been to meet and vanquish the adversary by corresponding weapons. Hence they concluded that it was necessary for them, in order to insure success, to erect a splendid house of worship—in a public, prominent and commanding situation;—and to call a minister whose pulpit talents would enable him to cope with the most admired of their opponents. They acted upon this plan. They erected a church among the most spacious and splendid in Massachusetts, if not in the United States; and they called a pastor among the most eloquent and admired pulpit orators in the country. The question which arises in our minds in contemplating these facts, is, Did the leaders in this undertaking go to work in the best way? Did they not count too much on human instrumentality? Were they not chargeable, in too great a degree, with “making flesh their arm?”

We do not profess to be intimately acquainted with all the circumstances of that enterprize, which was, doubtless, in its general character, noble and worthy of praise. But we make the above suggestion with diffidence, yet with frankness. Would not the undertaking have been more likely to succeed had it been entered upon and pursued with less of a spirit of worldly calculation; had outward splendor been less consulted; had, of course, a less profuse expenditure of funds been indulged, and a heavy and oppressive debt been more carefully avoided;—in a word, had there been less reliance on carnal weapons, and more on those of a purely spiritual kind? We know nothing, we decide nothing concerning this matter. But the longer we live, the more considerations of this kind impress us as deeply important. The more we look above and beyond human instrumentality the better. The King of Zion will not give his glory to another. None, we believe, are so likely to succeed in spiritual enterprises as those who place least reliance on human resources, or “the enticing words of man’s wisdom;” and most on the Spirit of the living God, who can make the humblest and feeblest instruments to triumph over the proudest and most mighty. We think if the apostle Paul had gone to Boston twenty

years ago, to stem the tide of Unitarianism, and to restore "the truth as it is in Jesus," he would hardly have adopted just the course that the excellent men did who planned and executed the establishment in "Park Street." He would have gone to work on a less ambitious plan, and on a smaller scale. He would not have "despised the day of small things;" but would have calculated by the divine blessing on much prayer and patience to form a body of spiritual worshippers, and as their number increased, to increase the means of their outward accommodation.

Dr. Griffin continued to be the pastor of this church about four years, when, as Dr. Sprague remarks, "in consequence of the congregation having become embarrassed by means of the war, and withal somewhat divided among themselves, he accepted an invitation to return to Newark, as pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, then lately rendered vacant by the dismissal of Mr. Cumming. Here he was installed on the 30th day of June 1815. Not long afterwards he had the pleasure of witnessing a general attention to religion among his people, and of gathering, as the result, a precious harvest into his spiritual garner.

In the spring of 1821, Dr. Griffin received an invitation to the presidency of Centre College, at Danville, Kentucky; and not long afterwards was invited to fill the same office in a college at Cincinnati, Ohio. But, after making a journey to the west, and taking a survey of the situation and prospects of both institutions, he thought it his duty to decline accepting either. Very soon afterwards, however, he was chosen to the presidency of Williams College, Massachusetts; and "owing chiefly to some unpropitious circumstances which had prevented the growth of his congregation, and rendered them unable to continue to him a competent support, he determined to accept the appointment. He, accordingly, left Newark with his family toward the latter end of October, 1821, and on the 14th of the following November was inaugurated as President of the College.

We cannot enter into details concerning his administration of the College during the fifteen years in which he filled the presidential chair. But it is due to his memory to state, that the College, which had been much reduced by various adverse occurrences, began to revive soon after he became its head; that repeated instances of religious attention took place under his ministry; and that, as long as he retained his health and strength, the institution went on to rise and flourish.

In the course of the year 1831, Dr. Griffin became deeply interested in reference to what has been called the "New Divinity,"—in other words, the theology closely allied to Pelagianism, which, for a few years past, has been taught by the divines of the New Haven school. He was strongly impressed with the belief, that the opinions entertained by the divines of that school were essentially at variance with the word of God, and tended to the subversion of fundamental gospel truth. Under this impression he published, in the course of the year just mentioned, three pamphlets, intended to expose and refute the opinions in question. These have been generally regarded as able and adapted to be useful. The next year (1832) he addressed a letter to the Rev. Dr. Taylor, of New Haven, begging him to explain more fully the peculiarities of the system commonly called by his name; at the same time apprising him that the information was sought for the purpose of making a public use of it, if such use should be called for or desirable.

Dr. Sprague has given us, at large, Dr. Taylor's reply; which, though the publication of it was interdicted at the time of its date, has now been committed to the press by the writer's permission. It is just such a reply as we should expect to find from the pen of a man who was conscious of holding opinions which he was unwilling explicitly to avow, and who was constantly endeavouring to hoodwink or amuse, by suggesting that he was not understood; or that he could not *then* take the time, or enter into sufficient detail, to explain. This was not the manner in which the venerable men who compiled our public standards, or the excellent divines who, since their time, adorned and blessed the church in our own country, treated similar interrogatories. They were always able and ready to make themselves understood. Concealment or equivocation made no part of *their* policy. We have been more and more convinced, by every attempt which the divines of the school in question have made to defend their system, that, in its leading features it is essentially Pelagian; that it is incapable of scriptural defence; and that the more carefully its practical influence is examined and marked, the more clearly it will be seen to subvert the gospel, and to destroy the interests of vital piety. The contest with this system is so far from being a mere verbal one, that we consider it as entering essentially into the fundamental principles of our holy religion; and are persuaded that, so far as it bears sway, the great doctrine of

regeneration, in its genuine Bible character, must be abandoned. For ourselves, we cannot see how men who profess the truth of God's word, as exhibited in Calvinistic formularies;—truth as taught by the venerable Edwards and Brainard, and the devoted men of their day; and who profess also to believe that men are sanctified by the truth; can consent to hold communion with those who, under the guise of conformity with great and good men who have long enjoyed the confidence of the pious, are insinuating errors adapted to corrupt the church of God, and to destroy the hopes of the soul. But to return to the subject of this memoir.

Dr. Griffin continued to preside over Williams College until the month of August, 1836, when, his declining health, and extreme feebleness induced him to tender his resignation to the board of Trustees. It was, with much regret, accepted; and he soon afterwards, removed to Newark, in New Jersey, where his eldest daughter resided, and where he spent the short remainder of his days, in the society of his pious and amiable children, and of the people of his former charge; and in the happy enjoyment of Christian consolation and hope.

In a few months after Dr. Griffin's return to Newark for the last time, his pious and excellent wife was removed by death. Her departure was peaceful and happy. This event took place in July, 1837. The doctor himself was now gradually, but very sensibly declining, in bodily strength, but evidently growing in faith and hope, and meetness for heaven. His last sermon was delivered at New Brunswick, in the pulpit of the Rev. Mr. Joseph H. Jones, September 10th, and his last appearance in public was three days afterwards, toward the close of the annual meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, when he made a short speech and prayer, exceedingly appropriate and touching in their character. He was now overtaken by strongly marked symptoms of dropsy, which rapidly increased, and hastened his decline. From this time he was never able to lie down. But though the "outward man was perishing," the "inward man was renewed day by day." All who approached his sick bed were deeply impressed with the cheerfulness of his submission, the elevation of his hope, and the triumph of his joy in Christ. Indeed a joy unspeakable and full of glory seemed almost constantly, and with increasing strength to fill his soul. In this heavenly frame

of mind, he left the world on the 8th day of November, 1837, in the 68th year of his age.

We wish we had room to insert at length the account of the last days of this eminent minister of Christ, as given by his eldest daughter, Mrs. Frances Louisa Smith, wife of Doctor Lyndon A. Smith, of Newark, under whose roof he closed his earthly course. It is drawn with so much intelligence united with simplicity, piety and tenderness, that it cannot be perused by a mind of sensibility without deep feeling.

We feel indebted to Dr. Sprague for this Memoir. He has executed, in our opinion, the task committed to him with much judgment and taste. We do not, indeed, in all cases, entirely agree with him in the estimate which he has expressed either of the peculiar talents of Doctor Griffin himself, or of the relative merit of his several publications. Still the subject of this memorial was no doubt, a highly gifted, and fervently pious man; who filled, and deserved to fill, a large space in his day; whose labours were eminently blessed of God; and whose memory thousands have reason to cherish with gratitude and love.

Dr. Griffin made a number of publications during his life, all of which did him honour, as a man of vigorous intellect, and of genuine eloquence. On the whole we concur with Dr. Sprague in the opinion that his "Park Street Lectures" stand at the head of all his publications, as a monument of his various talents. We do not, indeed, agree with every sentiment found in that volume; but no one, we think, can read it without profound respect for the intellectual compass and vigour, the deep feeling, and the fervent zeal for truth, and for the salvation of souls, which appear in every page.

His work on the Atonement, though it undoubtedly cost him much more time and thought than the "Lectures" just mentioned, was not an effort of equal success in regard to its popular impression. It was intended to meet and settle a controversy then going on respecting the *extent* of the atonement. And it cannot be denied that this work manifests much profound thinking, and evinces a large share of intellectual vigour. Few men are capable of the close thought, the accurate discrimination, and the pursuit of a train of reasoning through its intricate and extensive relations, which appear in this treatise. But it has been thought by some of the soundest judges that there is, at the same time, a boldness of speculation; a positiveness in laying down

questionable principles; a subtlety in making distinctions; and a metaphysical refinement in discussing scriptural truth, which have not the happiest tendency to elucidate "the simplicity that is in Christ." He has made a subject comparatively simple in itself, complex and unduly philosophical. His distinction between the "*lower* and *higher* ransom," is adapted to "darken counsel;" and while it is *intended* by the author to obviate the popular objections to a limited atonement, it concedes to the advocates of that doctrine every thing which they contend for, without removing a single difficulty. What he calls "the higher ransom," and which he acknowledges to be limited in its extent, the orthodox call "the atonement—Christ's death, including all its merit." So far as we recollect, Dr. Griffin must be considered as the inventor of this distinction between the higher and lower ransom; and as it had its origin with him, so we are inclined to think, it will find no advocates after him. In this work, too, he denies that the sufferings of Christ were penal; or that any act of substitution could make these sufferings the execution of divine justice. On these accounts the work in question may, long hence and often, be read as an exhibition of metaphysical ingenuity; but can never, we think, be a popular and edifying book with plain, simple-minded Christians, who are seeking to "know more of Christ, of the power of his resurrection, and of the fellowship of his sufferings, and to be conformed unto his death." And, accordingly, if we mistake not, its circulation has been smaller, and its acceptance with the religious public less than that of any other published production of the author's pen.

After the Memoir, in the first of the volumes before us, there are twenty, and in the second, forty of Dr. Griffin hitherto unpublished Sermons. The Doctor appears in these volumes, as he was in the pulpit, a very unequal preacher. This, indeed, could hardly fail to be the case with a mind so impulsive, and marked with such strong feeling as his was. Hence that equal and uniform excellence which appears in the pulpit discourses of some preachers, can by no means be considered as characterizing the discourses before us, in a mass. Many of them possess very high excellence. Rich in matter, and happy in manner, they are adapted entirely to sustain the reputation of the venerable author. Others occupy a lower grade of merit. But it may truly be said that they all manifest vigour and originality of mind, as well as a spirit of fervent piety.

In the midst of much admirable matter in these Sermons, we now and then meet with suggestions and speculations at which the cautions and well trained theologian will be constrained to hesitate. Of the examples which justify this remark we cannot enter into particulars. A single instance shall suffice. Of this character are some of the statements in the third Sermon, on the "federal headship of Adam." The author seems to speak of the celebrated *Stapfer* as if he were the accredited representative of strict Calvinism. This, however, is known to be by no means the case. In expressing, therefore, his concurrence with Stapfer in his views of the imputation of Adam's sin, real Calvinists will not fail to object. But, if we mistake not, Dr. Griffin does not really agree with Stapfer in his doctrine of "mediate imputation." We are constrained to think that a part of what he has taught on this subject is peculiar to himself. If our recollection does not fail us, we have not met with a theory in all respects like his before.

If we could have had access to Dr. Sprague we should have suggested to him the propriety of introducing into these volumes several, at least, of the sermons which Dr. Griffin preached on public occasions, and which were committed to the press many years ago. Some of these were uncommonly excellent, and well worthy of being preserved; and as a collection of them may not be soon, if at all attempted, we should have been glad to see a portion of the number preserved in this permanent form. We would especially single out in this remark, "The kingdom of Christ," a Missionary Sermon, preached before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, in 1805; the "Plea for Africa;" delivered before the Synod of New York and New Jersey, in 1817; "the Art of Preaching," delivered before the Pastoral Association of Massachusetts, in 1811; and the Sermon preached at the dedication of the Park Street Church, in Boston, 1810. These we should be glad to see preserved; and probably two or three others ought to be added to the list, if we could recollect at the moment all that he has published. We do not, however, speak of the exclusion of these sermons from the volumes before us, in the way of complaint. We have so much reason to thank Dr. Sprague for the able and satisfactory manner in which he has discharged the trust reposed in him, that we are only sorry that it did not fall in with his plan to give us a little more of the venerable man, whose memory he has so happily embalmed.

ART. V.—*General Assembly of 1839.*

OUR history of the General Assembly for the present year must be comparatively brief. The struggle which was so long carried on upon the floor of that body has ceased. We have, therefore, little to narrate beyond the ordinary routine of business. Hitherto also we have been furnished, by the several religious papers, with extended reports of the debates. Now we have little more than the minutes.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, met agreeably to appointment in the Seventh Presbyterian Church in the city of Philadelphia, on Thursday the 16th of May 1839, at 11 o'clock, and was opened by a sermon by the Rev. Wm. S. Plumer, D.D. moderator of the last Assembly, from Isaiah 41: 16. After the sermon, the moderator proceeded to the organization of the Assembly, and opened the meeting with prayer. The permanent clerk from the standing committee of commissions called the roll of the house; the whole number of delegates in attendance was one hundred and seventy, though all did not take their seats on the first day of the session.

The Rev. Joshua L. Wilson was elected moderator, and the Rev. Jacob Green temporary clerk.

Letter from the Synod of Canada.

Letters were received and read from the Rev. John Cook, moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of the two Canadas, and from the commission of the Synod of the Presbyterian church of Canada, in connexion with the Church of Scotland. These letters were listened to with greatest respect and interest. From the latter it appears that there are fifty-five settled ministers in connexion with that Synod, which, however, are very inadequate to the wants of the country, as there are "nearly a hundred congregations and settlements, some of them very numerous, that are wholly destitute of pastors." To supply this lamentable deficiency of preachers of the gospel, strenuous efforts are now making for establishing a Theological Seminary for the education of pious young men for the ministry. The whole tone of this letter is elevated and inspiring. It bespeaks at once the zeal for truth and the love for evangelical religion of its authors. The sympathy which it manifests in the trials of our church; the approbation which it expresses of the conduct of the Assembly;

and the cordial interest in our welfare which it exhibits, rendered it peculiarly gratifying to those to whom it was addressed. It derived additional value from the fact, that it was written after the decision of the church case at *Nisi Prius* against the Assembly, and before the reversal of that decision was known. "We cannot, brethren," say the writers, "contemplate the decision that has recently been given against you in the civil court, without sorrow and astonishment. That the case should ever have been carried to a civil tribunal, must be matter of surprise to all who hold, that the church ought, and does, possess sufficient power in her own judicatories for deciding all questions of doctrine, discipline, and government. But, let the issue before civil courts be what it may, your triumph depends not on it. A victory has already been gained, worth every sacrifice which you may be required to make. A church, that holds fast the truth, may lose her property, and suffer much temporary embarrassment; yet, in His eyes, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, she is rich—all glorious within, and eminently powerful for good. A church becomes poor, and weak, and despicable, only when she breaks covenant with God, and permits truth to perish from among her people."

Semi-centenary Celebration.

On the second day of the sessions of the Assembly, the Rev. Dr. Breckinridge made the following motion, viz: *Resolved*, That this Assembly will celebrate with appropriate religious solemnities, the 21st of May instant, as the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, with particular reference to the many signal blessings and deliverances which God has vouchsafed to our beloved church, in its whole history, and especially to that recent deliverance over which we now rejoice. This motion, after some discussion, was adopted. In accordance with this resolution the Assembly observed the 21st of May in the manner prescribed, when addresses were made by the Rev. Drs. Green and Alexander, and by Pres. Young. Dr. Green, bending under the weight of years, standing "like a solitary tree, where once a forest stood," gave a historical sketch of the church from the organization of the General Assembly in 1789. In this address the venerable father, who is one of the two or three survivors of the framers of our present con-

stitution, adverted to the remarkable increase and prosperity of our church since the formation of the General Assembly; to the signal deliverances which during the last fifty years we have experienced; and to the spiritual blessings which God has granted us within the same period. It appears that when the Assembly was formed there were in connexion with that body about one hundred and seventy ministers, the number at present in connexion with it is one thousand two hundred and seventy. And before the late schism the number was twenty-two or three hundred. The increase in the number of communicants and churches has been no less remarkable. We forbear, however, to cite further from this address, as it has already been published, and will no doubt be very extensively read.

State of the Church.

On motion of Rev. Dr. Nott, it was resolved that a committee on the State of the Church be appointed, consisting of a member from each of the Synods represented in the Assembly. This committee subsequently made a report to the following effect, viz.

"Whereas the churches connected with this Assembly previous to the year 1837, have been divided, and now exist in two distinct organizations; and, whereas, a committee of the Assembly, previous to any action on the question of such division, did settle the terms then deemed to be fair and equitable; and, whereas, this Assembly, notwithstanding the issue of the legal proceedings already had, are sincerely desirous, not only of preventing all further litigation, especially among the members of individual churches, but of doing ample justice to the churches once in connexion with them, but now in connexion with another body: therefore

"Resolved, That this Assembly hereby assent to the terms, substantially, then proposed, viz: That the corporate funds and property of the church, so far as they appertain to the Theological Seminaries at Princeton and Alleghanytown, or to the support of professors, or the education of beneficiaries, shall remain the property of this Assembly; and that its faith be pledged for raising a sum, equal in amount to a moiety of all the remaining permanent funds, which may be divided without a manifest violation of the will of the respective donors thereof, or of the trust upon which the same are holden; to be paid over by the trustees of the person or persons appointed by the other Assembly to receive the same.

"And if any legislative action shall be deemed by the other Assembly necessary for securing to it all the property or funds of congregations or theological seminaries that may belong in equity to the portion of the church within its jurisdiction,

"Resolved, that this Assembly will acquiesce in the procuring of such legislative action so far as this can, in the judgment of their legal counsel, be done consistently with the preservation of their own rights and privileges.

"And that the trustees of the General Assembly be authorized to negotiate, on the part of this Assembly, on the principles herein set forth, an amicable and final settlement of all matters in controversy, so far as church property is concerned, to take effect as soon as the same shall have been mutually agreed to

between the parties concerned—and not otherwise to be hereafter considered binding upon this Assembly: and if the parties shall not agree as to the equities concerned, that one referee shall be appointed by each, and a third by the two, and the decision of the whole or a majority of such referees shall be final in the premises.

“Where congregations have divided or shall divide in consequence of the division of the General Assembly, and attach themselves to the one body or the other,

“Resolved, That in all cases where equity requires a division of the church property, that the same ought, in the judgment of this Assembly, to be equitably divided.

“And when the parties cannot agree as to the equities in question, that each one select one referee, and the two a third, and that the three, or a majority thereof, have full power to settle the whole terms of such division.

“And that where majorities refuse to make such division, that minorities ought not, in ordinary cases, to resort to legal process, for establishing what may be deemed to be their equitable rights, until every effort for obtaining an amicable arrangement shall have failed, and not (when practicable, without great inconvenience) until the Presbytery or Synod to which they belong shall have been consulted.”

After considerable discussion, the Rev. William L. Breckinridge proposed a series of resolutions as a substitute for this report, which was referred to the committee on the state of the church, and having been slightly modified, was adopted, and is as follows, viz.

“Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America,

“1. That this body considers itself and the church at large bound, as both have been not only willing but desirous, to adjust all claims against the corporate property of the church, whether legal or equitable, in the most prompt, and fair, and liberal manner.

“2. That this is especially the case touching any claims which may exist on the part of the four Synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee, and the Western Reserve, declared in 1837 to be no part of the Presbyterian Church, or on the part of those who seceded from the church in 1838, or on the part of any body constituted out of the whole or any part of these elements. And that in regard to all and each of these bodies and persons, the Assembly will faithfully adhere to any pledge or promise, expressed or implied, which it can justly be construed ever to have made, and will fulfil every expectation which it ever knowingly allowed to be cherished.

“3. The trustees of the Assembly are hereby authorised and requested to do, on the part of this Assembly, should occasion offer, whatever is lawful, competent, and equitable in the premises, conformably to the principles and in the manner heretofore laid down in the minutes of the Assembly for 1837 and 1838, so far as relates to the corporate property of the church, or any equities springing out of the same.

“4. With reference to all institutions, corporations, congregations, and other public persons or bodies in connexion with us, but holding property for ecclesiastical purposes or for religious and benevolent uses, which property is not subject to the control of the Assembly, although the said persons, institutions, or congregations may be; in all such cases, where difficulties relating to property have arisen or shall arise in consequence of the long and painful disorders and divisions in our church, we advise all our members and friends to act on the general principles heretofore laid down, and with the spirit of candour, forbearance and equity, which has dictated this act.

"5. The Assembly reiterates the declaration, that its chief desire on all this part of our church troubles, is to do even and ready justice to and between all persons and interests over which it has any control, or in regard to which it has any duty to perform."

It is believed that a considerable proportion of the Assembly, would have preferred the original report, with some slight verbal alterations, but as the substitute was accepted by Dr. Nott, and made the report of the committee, it was adopted with great unanimity. It is evident that in neither form could it meet the expectations of our New School brethren. Their demands, however, we are persuaded, will be regarded by unprejudiced men as very unreasonable. It should be remembered that a proposition for an amicable separation of the church was made to them in 1836, when they were in the majority, at least apparently, in the General Assembly. This proposition was formally renewed, on terms which some of their own organs pronounced more liberal than they had any reason to expect, during the sessions of the Assembly of 1837. It was repeated in the fall of that year. Every effort, therefore, was made on our side to have the separation effected amicably. Had these propositions been acceded to, neither party would have been a secession. Instead, however, of acceding to these terms, the New School made a violent separation in 1838, and appealed to the civil courts. The necessary consequence of this mode of proceeding was, that one party or the other must be pronounced seceders. The law could recognise but one General Assembly. If theirs was recognised as the true one, ours must be pronounced a schismatical body. And on the other hand, if we were recognised, they must be pronounced seceders. They brought the matter to this issue, most unreasonably and improperly as we think, to the great injury of religion and of their own reputation. But having done it, they have no right to complain of the result. They now consider it an insult to be called seceders. Yet they, not merely in the newspapers, but in official documents, continue so to denominate us, in the face of the very tribunal to which they appealed to decide which was the seceding body. Surely such complaints must excite very little sympathy. The conditions on which they insist in order to an amicable adjustment of the difficulty are in the highest degree unreasonable and unjust. They require that we should give up our charter; which, our lawyers tell us, would be to invalidate the title to all the property. But suppose this was not the case. What possible object can be accomplished by giv-

ing up our present charter, in order to receive another in precisely the same terms, and for precisely the same objects? If they wish a charter for trustees of the General Assembly of the American Presbyterian Church let them apply for it. We are ready to do every thing in our power to facilitate the success of such an application. But why should we be obliged to apply for a charter for trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States, when this is the very style and title of the existing charter, and when there is not a word in that charter which even the opposite party, so far as we know, would wish to have altered? Such an application would be ridiculous. Did any one ever hear of a body of men, going to a legislature, and saying, re-enact that charter word for word, and we will give it up? There is no sense or reason in any such proposition, unless we are required to give up the legal succession. This cannot be given up without forfeiting our property; and if we were to relinquish it, it would do the opposite party no manner of good. They would not be the succession. The title to their property would not be made more secure. It is therefore a demand to do ourselves a great injury, without doing them the least good. All this is said, on the assumption, that the parties stand on equal ground; that they are equally entitled to the name and character of the Presbyterian church in the United States. But this is very far from being a just assumption. One moiety of their body has openly and officially resolved that they will not conform to the fundamental principles of presbyterianism; and the other, of their own accord, withdrew from our connexion. And still they claim to be the representatives of the Presbyterian church. This whole subject has been greatly mystified. Yet it is very plain. Judge Rogers, the court in Bank, the counsel for the New School party, as we understand the matter, all admit, that the General Assembly had a perfect right to abolish the Plan of Union of 1801. That Plan, as understood by both parties in the church, allowed congregationalists to sit and vote on all occasions in our presbyteries, as ruling elders. This has not only been the general understanding of the plan, but the uniform practice under it, from 1801 to the present day. But Judge Rogers says in his charge, that for a member of another denomination to sit and vote in any of our judicatories, is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, and that any act allowing such a proceeding, even if sanctioned by the presbyteries, would be

null and void, because inconsistent with the act of the legislature of Pennsylvania granting the charter.* Notwithstanding this legal abrogation of the plan, and this flagrant unconstitutional practice under it, the several excised presbyteries declared they would disregard that abrogation, and continue that practice. That is, they deliberately resolved that they would not conform to what their own Judge pronounces to be the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, while they insist upon being recognised as good Presbyterians and allowed to sit in our highest judicatory. Because the General Assembly would not submit to this, a small minority of the delegates organized by themselves, received these recusants, and claim to be the true General Assembly of the Presbyterian church. Mankind are rational beings. It is impossible that these plain facts should fail, in spite of all misrepresentations, to work their way into the public mind. And we firmly believe that the just and good men among the New School party itself, will soon come to regard the disorderly organization of 1838 as a most unreasonable proceeding, and the claims founded on that organization as in the highest degree unrighteous. It cannot be that good men can continue to believe, that those who will not submit to the fundamental rules of a church, have a right to be in that church and to control its action. And no man who does not so believe can justify the course of the New School, or sympathize with their present feelings.

* This opinion of the flagrant unconstitutionality of the Plan of Union the old school party have uniformly asserted. Judge Rogers pronounced that plan constitutional, and reconciled that decision with the above cited declaration, by giving the plan a new interpretation. The plan declares, that "provided the said standing committee of any church, shall depute one of themselves to attend presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the presbytery, as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian church." This provision, it seems, the judge interpreted to mean that in case a Congregational church member was to be tried before the presbytery, a committeeman might be deputed to sit and act in the adjudication of that particular cause, but further than that he had no right to a seat. This interpretation is at variance with the uniform understanding and practice of the church. It is a great unfairness, on the part of the organs of the new school party, to cite Judge Rogers as sanctioning the Plan of Union, when they know that he pronounced the practice, which his opinion is cited to sustain, inconsistent with the fundamental principles of presbyterianism. It may be said, that Chief Justice Gibson decided that the Plan of Union was constitutionally enacted. This is true. While we fully believe that the opinion of Judge Gibson is, in the main, obviously correct and just, there are positions in it which we consider very incorrect. So, too, while the new school concur in the conclusion to which Judge Rogers endeavoured to bring the jury, it is impossible they should approve of all the principles which he lays down. This only shows the impropriety of bringing such cases before civil tribunals.

Anniversary of the Assembly's Boards.

The Assembly resolved to celebrate these anniversaries during its own sessions, in hopes that the facts presented in the several reports would have a tendency to awaken the interest, and increase the zeal of its members in the prosecution of the objects to which these Boards are devoted. The experiment proved eminently successful. The anniversary of the Board of Education was celebrated on Wednesday, May 22. The report of the Board was read by the Rev. Francis M'Farland, the corresponding secretary. In consequence of the lamented illness of the Rev. Mr. Peabody, the financial and assistant secretary, full reports from the auxiliaries had not been secured. From this and other causes, the number of candidates reported this year is much less than usual. The number, as far as ascertained, is three hundred and thirty-eight. The whole amount of money received, including a small balance at the commencement of last year, is \$33,930. 77. The expenditures were \$32,793. 26, leaving a balance in the treasury of \$1,137. 51. After the reading of the report, several members addressed the Assembly on the subjects brought to view in that document. The object of the speakers was to suggest improvements in the constitution of the Board, and in the mode of conducting its operations. This was happily done by Dr. Plumer, Pres. Young, Dr. Alexander, Dr. Breckinridge, and others. The report of the Board was referred to Messrs. Young, A. Alexander, and M'Kenzie. This committee made a report which was adopted as follows, viz.

"Resolved, That the report of the Board of Education be approved.

"As misapprehension has sometimes arisen in the minds of the beneficiaries of the Board, as well as in the minds of others, in regard to the light in which the Board and the Church view the assistance furnished to candidates for the gospel ministry under their care, your committee deem it expedient so to alter the second article of the constitution, as to assert more clearly the donative character of the assistance; they therefore recommend the adoption of the following, in lieu of the second article of the constitution, viz. In all other cases the aid contributed to any candidate for the ministry shall be considered as a donation, which he is under no other obligation to return, than that moral obligation which must necessarily arise out of the nature of the case.

"And, whereas, there is a very great and increasing demand for preachers of the gospel, as well to supply our moral destitutions at home as to evangelize the hundreds of millions of heathen who are perishing without instruction—and, whereas, our Church, if we compare its efforts with its ability, will be found doing very little in this great work, neither being engaged extensively and earnestly in prayer to God for the multiplication of Gospel labourers, nor presenting sufficiently to the minds of its youth the wants of a dying world, and the claims of their Redeemer to the unreserved consecration of their powers to

his service as preachers of the gospel—and, whereas, we feel that we can rely confidently on the blessing of God to enlarge our operations, and increase our success, if we endeavour, in dependence on him, to use all active and vigorous measures, both for multiplying the numbers and securing the intellectual and moral advancement of our candidates for the gospel ministry, as well as all suitable means for guarding against the intrusion into the sacred office of those who would desecrate its functions. Therefore,

“Resolved, 1. That it be earnestly recommended to the pastors and members of our churches that prayer be made to God continually, that he would pour out his Spirit on the hearts of our young men, and prepare multitudes of them to serve him in the ministry of reconciliation.

“2. That it be recommended to our pastors and elders to look out, in all our churches, for young men of suitable piety and talents, who may be educated under the care and by the assistance of the church, for the work of the gospel ministry; to converse and pray with such young men on the subject of their dedicating themselves to the service of God, in preaching the gospel; and to endeavour by every proper means to induce them to qualify themselves for becoming the ambassadors of Christ to their perishing fellow men.

“3. That while the Assembly would recommend to the Board of Education the exercise of all due caution in the reception of its candidates, and a strict supervision of them during their whole course of instruction, to prevent the sacred funds entrusted to their management by the Church, from being perverted to the support of those who are unworthy of the patronage of the Church, the Assembly would also recommend to the Board to aim at a great enlargement of their operations and usefulness—and to effect this desirable object they would recommend to the Board to use increased exertions to augment, not merely the contributions of our churches to this cause, but the number of candidates under their care.

“4. That it is the deliberate conviction of this Assembly, formed as the result of much experience, that an efficient system of agencies by which all the churches of our connexion may be visited from year to year, is, in the present condition of Christian feeling and knowledge on the subject of benevolent operations, absolutely indispensable—that the Assembly therefore earnestly recommend to the Board of Education the employment of a suitable number of zealous and discreet agents, by whose instrumentality or the instrumentality of voluntary agents engaged to co-operate with them, all the churches may have this important cause annually presented before them—and the Assembly would recommend to its churches that they receive with kindness and hearty co-operation the labours of the agents of all our ecclesiastical Boards remembering that the service in which these brethren are engaged is an arduous self-denying service, undertaken not for filthy lucre, but for the glory of God, that our people may have an opportunity of understanding their duty, and discharging it in reference to the advancement of Christ's kingdom in its various branches.

“5. That it be recommended to the Presbyteries to adopt the plan of the Board, heretofore published, so far as to examine and recommend all candidates for pecuniary aid, who may reside within their bounds; and that they continue to exercise over such candidates, while in the course of education, such care and supervision as may be necessary—and when the conduct of any beneficiary shall be such as to require his dismissal from a place on the funds of the Board, that the Presbytery to which he belongs be informed of the same.”

Board of Domestic Missions.

The report of this Board was read by the secretary, Dr. William M'Dowell, on Thursday, May 23; on which occasion several addresses were made. It appears from this re-

port that the number of missionaries and agents in the service of the Board during the year was two hundred and sixty; the receipts \$41,759. 77. The missionaries report the accession of fourteen hundred members to the churches under their care upon examination, and thirteen hundred and fifty upon certificate; the whole number of communicants being about twenty thousand. They report further the organization of sixty new churches, and the erection of a hundred houses of worship; also four hundred Sunday schools, with about twenty thousand scholars; three hundred catechetical and bible classes, with six thousand learners; three hundred temperance societies; one hundred bible and ninety missionary societies. The report was referred to Messrs. Smyth, Platt and Holmes, who recommended the following resolutions, which were adopted, viz.

"I. Resolved that this Assembly having heard from the report of the Board of Missions of the continued and increasing prosperity of the cause of Domestic Missions, as manifested in the increase of funds, of missionaries, and of the churches under their care, would record their grateful acknowledgements to the Head of the Church, who, in the midst of all her trials, has thus graciously smiled upon her.

"II. Resolved, That whereas the present position of the Board, and the nature of their present engagements, require on their part, a great enlargement of their plans and efforts in accordance with the suggestions of the report—particularly in the vast regions of the West, the South, and the South-west, including also Texas, which is calling loudly for their immediate assistance—this Assembly do most earnestly urge upon all its ministers and churches the claims of this Board.

"While the churches generally approve of this Board, and give their hearty approval to the great duty of missions, this Assembly learns, with the most painful disappointment and surprise, that not more probably than two-thirds of our pastors or churches, do at present render any assistance to the Church in prosecuting this great work. They would therefore affectionately commend this duty to every minister and church session, and express their confident hope that this appeal will meet with an universal and cheerful response.

"III. Resolved, That to secure this desirable object—inasmuch as the report, when published, though sent to every minister, cannot be generally circulated among the members of our churches, it be recommended to the pastors of churches to spread before their people the substance of this report, by reading it from the pulpit, at such time as may be most convenient for taking up an annual collection in behalf of this Board.

"IV. Resolved, That while the necessity for agents is at present felt and recognised by the Assembly, in order ultimately to remove this necessity, and thus to reduce the expenditures of the Board, the individual agency and co-operation of every minister and church session, in forwarding the interests of this Board, would, in the opinion of this Assembly, if faithfully employed, with the least expense and the greatest certainty, advance the cause, and multiply the resources of the Board."

Board of Foreign Missions.

The report of this Board was presented on Friday, and read by the corresponding secretary. After several addresses

had been made, the report was referred to Messrs. H. R. Wilson, R. B. Campbell, and M'Caleb. It appears from this report, that the Board received during the past year (including a balance from the preceding year of \$4,200.44) \$62,977.62. This sum is exclusive of \$2,500 received from the American Tract Society, and \$1,000 from the American Bible Society, to be appropriated for the use of those societies. The expenditures during the same period have been \$53,590.06, leaving a balance, which is already appropriated, of \$9,409.56. During the year five additional missionaries have been sent into the field. The stations now occupied in Northern India, are, first, Lodiana, Subathu, and Saharunpur, forming one mission. In this mission there are six ordained missionaries, one printer, one teacher, and two native assistants. Twenty-four works, in five different languages, have issued from the press at this station, comprising in all 1,355,030 pages. There appears to be about three hundred scholars taught at the various schools of this mission. Second mission, Allahabad and Futteghur, with six ordained missionaries and two native assistants. This mission is of more recent date than the preceding. There are about one hundred and sixty scholars in its several schools. Three additional ordained missionaries, it is expected, will be sent to these missions the coming fall.

Among the American Indians the Board have two missions; one among the Ioways and Sacs, where there are three male and four female labourers; and one among the Chippewas and Ottowas, where there are two ordained missionaries.

In Western Africa they have at present but one missionary. Two other brethren have been accepted for this field, who are expected to sail the ensuing autumn.

In China the present station is Singapore. The success which has already attended the exertions of this Board, which is yet in its infancy, is highly encouraging; and it is believed that the church, having, after many struggles and embarrassments, fairly entered on the work of foreign missions, will exert herself, in some measure, in a manner worthy of the greatness of the enterprise. We perceive that the Board have it in contemplation, in addition to the stations already occupied, to establish missions at Calcutta, Assam, among the Malays, at Marseilles in France, and Barcelona in Spain. The church would doubtless rejoice to see these and many other positions advantageously occupied. But we believe the true wisdom of the Board will consist in the selec-

tion of some few important stations, and concentrating their efforts upon them. What can two or three, or even half a dozen men do in the midst of a population of twenty or thirty millions? Experience teaches us that, under the ordinary blessings of God's providence and grace, it is a slow and difficult work to change the religion of a nation. In our age this result is not brought about by miracle, but by the divine blessing on the persevering use of those means which are adapted to form the minds and hearts of the people. This being the case, it is evident that it is time and effort thrown away, to conduct the missionary work on a small scale; to scatter the resources of its friends over the whole field, without effectually cultivating any one spot. We do not make these remarks under the impression that the Board are likely to act upon a different plan. On the contrary, as we understand their purpose, it is to concentrate their strength on a few important fields, while at the same time they occupy certain "centres of influence" with men of talents and experience, who may facilitate their general operations.

The Assembly adopted, at the recommendation of the committee to whom this report was referred, the following resolutions, viz.

"1. Resolved, That it becomes the Assembly to entertain gratitude in no ordinary degree, to the Great Head of the Church, for his smiles upon the operations of our infant missionary institution.

"2. Resolved, That the Assembly approves the views of the Executive Committee, to which the Board have responded, with the deepest sensibility, in regard to the ancient people of God.

"The Jews are a people in whose salvation we ought to take a lively interest, and in relation to whom we ought most carefully to observe the developments of Divine Providence, and vigorously seize every opportunity, as it offers, of doing them good.

"3. Resolved, That the Assembly sympathises very deeply with the Board, in the expression of its sense of the immense obligations resting on the Presbyterian Church, to increase its efforts for the conversion of the world to God. And as, in the providence of God, our beloved Zion is now in a condition to act with unity and concert on this subject, it is the duty of all to devote themselves, with increased zeal and energy, to extend the knowledge of the truth at home and abroad.

"4. Resolved, As the foreign missionary field is ripe for the harvest, that it is to be regretted that the labourers are so few, and that of the many young men in our midst, from year to year entering the sacred office, so few have engaged personally in the work of foreign missions.

"5. Resolved, That, as there are many important openings for missionary effort and influence in the Papal, Pagan, and Mahomedan world, requiring not only pious and devoted men, but also men of more than common talents, acquirements, experience and influence, the Assembly most earnestly recommend the urgent claims of missions to such men, as well as to our ministers and candidates for the ministry generally; and that they be entreated to examine prayer-

fully, whether they should not hold themselves in readiness to enter the foreign field, and go far hence to the Gentiles.

"6. Resolved, That in view of these great and important principles and interests, the Assembly is of opinion that it is the duty of our Foreign Board to call to the occupation of these important centres of influence, any of the servants of God whom they shall judge to be properly qualified.

"7. Resolved, That 6000 copies of the report be printed and extensively circulated,"

Board of Publication.

This is the new designation of the Assembly's Board of publication of Tract and Sunday School Books. The name was changed as its field of operation has been enlarged. Instead of being confined to the publication of Tracts and Sunday School Books, to it is now "committed the publication, on behalf of the Assembly, of such works, permanent and periodical, as are adapted to promote sound learning and true religion." This is one of the most important enterprises in which our church has ever engaged. The influence of the press is the paramount influence in the civilized world. The pulpit can hardly rival it. That it is the duty of the friends of religion to avail themselves of this engine cannot be disputed. And as our church has determined, as a church, to exert her energies in the various enterprises of benevolence, there can, we presume, be little diversity of opinion, as to the propriety of the organization of the above mentioned Board. There has been such an organization in intimate, though not, perhaps, ecclesiastical connexion with the church of England for more than a century, and its influence has been very extensive and powerful. Our Methodist brethren, who are exceedingly wise in their generation, have long had a similar establishment. And we can see no reason why the Presbyterian church should not avail herself of the same means of doing good. It must however be admitted that it is an enterprise of great difficulty and delicacy. The character of the church is committed in a great degree to this Board. If their selection of works for publication be not judicious, the evil will be immense. The past operations of the Board promise well for the future. They have published 104,000 copies of eighteen different tracts and volumes. Among the works ordered for publication, are Stevenson on the offices of Christ, as abridged by Dr. Plumer; Guthrie's Christian's Great Interest; Gouge's Christian Directions; Charnock on Christ Crucified; and Brooke's Mute Christian. It will be a great blessing to the church, if, by means of this Board, the spirituality and deep experience of the writers of

the 16th century can be infused into our ministers and members.

Complaint of A. D. Metcalf and others.

This was a complaint against the Synod of Virginia, for deciding that appeals may lie in cases not judicial. The decision complained of, the reasons of complaint assigned by the complainants, and the whole record of the Synod in the case were read. The two parties, the complainants and the Synod, having been heard, the roll was called that each member of the Assembly might have an opportunity of expressing his opinion. After which the vote was taken and the complaint was sustained. That is, the General Assembly decided that appeals cannot lie except in judicial cases.

We regret that it is not in our power to present such a view of this case, as we have been accustomed to give on similar occasions. We have no statement, in the minutes, of the nature of the question decided by the Synod of Virginia; nor any report of the arguments for and against sustaining the complaint. We are obliged, therefore, to content ourselves with the following remarks on the principle involved in the above decision of the Assembly. As this subject has already been discussed at some length on our pages,* it may seem unnecessary to say any more on the subject. As, however, the recent decision has again brought it before the churches, it may not be improper to devote a few pages to its consideration. It is really a matter of importance. It would be a hard case if a party, suffering under a grievous wrong, should be turned away from the bar of our highest judicatory, merely on the ground that he had mistaken the nature of his remedy. The history of this question is a little curious. We have had a superior judicatory in our church for more than a hundred and twenty years. During about seventy years of this period, our discipline was conducted according to the Westminster Directory. In 1789 our present constitution went into operation; which was submitted to an extensive revision and alteration, as to matters of detail, in 1821. Under these several systems, appeals and complaints were allowed without hindrance or contradiction, from any kind of decision in an inferior judicatory, by a person who felt himself aggrieved, until 1834. Then, for the first time in our history, as far as we know, the idea was

* See Biblical Repertory, 1835, January and April Numbers.

started that appeals and complaints could be made only in cases strictly judicial. The occasion on which this doctrine was advanced was the following. The Synod of Philadelphia had passed an act by which they first received the second presbytery as organized by the Assembly; secondly, united that presbytery with the presbytery of Philadelphia; and, thirdly, divided this united presbytery by a geographical line. From this act the Assembly's presbytery appealed and complained. When the case came before the Assembly the Rev. Samuel G. Winchester, in an ingenious and eloquent speech, which was afterwards published in various forms, took the ground that "it is only from the decisions of a judicatory sitting as a court, for judicial business, that appeals and complaints can be entertained." That this novel doctrine was not at that time the doctrine of the Synod, which the Rev. Gentleman defended, is plain, from the fact, that they had referred for adjudication to that very Assembly "An appeal and complaint of the fifth church, Philadelphia, relative to the call of Dr. Beman."* That venerable body therefore, could hardly be surprised that the Assembly overruled Mr. Winchester's plea, and proceeded to exercise a jurisdiction which had been thus explicitly recognised by the very body in whose behalf the plea was urged. Though the Synod was thus free from this new doctrine in May 1834, it grew into such sudden favour, that when that body met the following autumn, they decided not merely that appeals and complaints could not lie except in judicial cases, but even that protests were in the same predicament. This is an instructive illustration of the fact that the wisest and best men sometimes allow themselves to be run away with by a plausible idea, though contrary to all their own previous professions and practice. This, however, was a mere temporary delusion. The members of that Synod who had signed or allowed protests in all kinds of cases before, still continued to sign or allow them, with equal freedom, their own decision to the contrary notwithstanding. We had fondly hoped that the whole doctrine was quietly forgotten. We had good reason for this hope. We found its very authors and advocates disregarding it the very next year; acting as though no such doctrine had ever been broached. If they practically abandoned it as untenable, we may be excused for feeling some surprise at its resurrection in a new and

* Minutes of the Assembly of 1834, p. 8.

distant quarter. It is, however, shorn of its just proportions. The Synod of Philadelphia extended the doctrine to appeals, complaints and protests. Thus putting minorities completely under the feet of majorities, not allowing them even the right of recording their dissent with the reasons for it. Mr. Winchester confined the doctrine to appeals and complaints; these Virginia gentlemen to appeals alone. In this last form it is certainly less objectionable than in either of the others.

In order to understand this matter, we must know precisely what is meant by judicial decisions, to which it is said, appeals and complaints, or appeals alone, are confined. There is a good deal of confusion and error often occasioned by the mere designation of our ecclesiastical bodies as courts or judicatories. They are so called when not sitting in a judicial capacity. We find lawyers much troubled to know what we mean by courts; and disposed to run analogies between the different civil tribunals and those found in our church. This has been a fruitful source of mistake as to the nature of our form of government. It is to this source the "Member of the New York Bar" seems indebted for his strange misconceptions on this subject, which have cost those who confided in his wisdom so dearly. If our system and nomenclature trouble the lawyers, it is no less true that the lawyers trouble us. They often bring with them into ecclesiastical bodies modes of thinking and reasoning borrowed from their previous pursuits, which are entirely inappropriate to our system. Our good brother Winchester will excuse our saying this is precisely his difficulty. His whole printed speech on the subject before us, is distinguished by this lawyer-like kind of reasoning; a strenuous insisting on the precise legal sense of terms, and thence deriving a rule of construction which makes the constitution speak a language which it was never intended to speak. Our courts are bodies *sui generis*; they include within themselves legislative, executive and judicial powers. Yet this division is in a great measure arbitrary. These several powers are but different modes of exercising the general governing authority in the church; and it is often very difficult to say whether a particular act should be placed under the one or the other of these heads. Still the classification, though not so definite as might be desired, is useful. To the exercise of legislative powers are referred the numerous rules which constitute our form of government, which were enacted in a certain prescribed way. To the same head belongs the various standing rules, which,

though they form no part of the constitution, are of force until properly repealed; such, for example, as the rules which regulate the reception of foreign ministers, &c. The head of executive powers is the most comprehensive of all, as to it belongs almost every act, except such as concern the exercise of discipline, which is designed to carry into effect the various provisions of our complicated system. Hence the examination, the licensing, ordaining, installing, dismissing ministers; the erection, division, and dissolution of churches, presbyteries and synods, are all executive acts. On the other hand, "the judicial power of the church," says Principal Hill of Scotland, "appears in the infliction or removal of those censures which belong to a spiritual society." This passage has been quoted as defining the nature of those acts from which alone complaints and appeals can properly be taken. The class of acts contemplated, therefore, is that which concerns the infliction or removal of ecclesiastical censures. That this is a correct statement of the case, further appears from the nature of the arguments by which this doctrine is sustained. These arguments are derived from the words *cause, trial, sentence, parties*, &c., which occur in the chapter which treats of appeals and complaints, and which, it is said, determine the nature of the cases from which an appeal may lie, or against which a complaint may be made. The definition given above of judicial acts, viz. that they are such as relate to the infliction or removal of ecclesiastical censures, is however far from being complete. A church court often sits in a judicial capacity, without any reference either to the infliction or removal of censure. Take the case before the last Assembly. The synod of Virginia decided that an appeal could lie in cases not judicial. Mr. A. D. Metcalf and others complain of this decision. The matter comes before the Assembly. That body being duly warned by the moderator that it is about to sit in its judicial capacity, hears what the synod has to say in defence of its decision, and what the complainants had to say against it, and then gave their judgment. The Assembly acted judicially; it sat in judgment on the decision of a lower court. Yet it neither inflicted nor removed any ecclesiastical censure. The synod of Virginia was no more censured by having its decision reversed, than a district court of the United States is censured when the supreme court reverses its opinion on a point of law. There are therefore a multitude of cases in which our courts act judicially, which are not judicial cases, in the sense of the above cited

definition; cases in which there is no offence, no offender, no testimony, and no trial in the ordinary sense of the terms. Besides, a case which is properly executive in one stage, may become judicial in another stage of its progress. Or to speak more correctly, any executive act of a lower court may be made the subject of judicial examination in a higher one. Thus, for example, when the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, as organized by the Assembly, divided the Fifth Presbyterian church in that city, contrary to the wishes of a majority of the people, Thomas Bradford and others of the aggrieved party, brought the matter before the Assembly of 1835. There the case was regularly adjudicated; both parties were heard, and the decision was reversed. This new doctrine therefore rests upon a very unstable basis. It is founded on an imperfect classification of the acts of our judicatories; and assumes that the judicial function has reference to the mere infliction or removal of censures.

Let us examine the nature of the arguments which have been adduced in support of this new doctrine. Our constitution says, "That every kind of decision which is formed in any church judicatory, except the highest, is subject to the review of a superior judicatory, and may be carried up in one or the other of the four following ways: 1. General review and control; 2. Reference; 3. Appeal; and 4. Complaint." The question is, what is the meaning of this plain declaration? It does not mean, because it does not say, that every individual decision, but *every kind* of decision may be carried up in either of these four ways. These different forms of redress contemplate different circumstances, and are not all available in every particular case. A reference, for example, must be made by the body itself, and not by an individual member; but the body may refer any kind of case. An appeal supposes an aggrieved party, but he may appeal from any kind of decision which directly affects himself. A complaint supposes some kind of impropriety in the act complained of, but it may be entered against any kind of act alleged to be improper. So that any kind of decision may be regularly brought up in each of the several ways specified above. That this is the true meaning of this article, might be inferred with certainty from the fact that it has always been so understood and acted upon; and that it is almost a literal transcript of the Scottish rule on the same subject, which has always been interpreted and applied in the same way. We are now told, however, that this is not its mean-

ing; that we must lay particular stress on the word *or*. 'Every kind of decision may be carried up in one *or* the other of the four following ways;' one kind in one way, and another kind in another way. In the Scotch rule, however, whence ours was taken, there is no *or*. Principal Hill gives it thus: "Every ecclesiastical business that is transacted in any church judicatory is subject to the review of its ecclesiastical superiors, and may be brought before the court immediately above in four different ways, by review, by reference, by appeal, and by complaint." If, therefore, the emendators of our book had left out that little word, and said: Every kind of decision may be carried up in four different ways, review, reference, appeal, and complaint; there would have been an end of the matter; or rather, there never could have been a beginning to the new doctrine. Yet who can doubt that this is precisely what they meant to say, who compares the two rules, and remembers, that our practice, both before and since the emendation, was precisely, as far as the point now in debate is concerned, the same as that of the Scotch church?

The main dependance of the advocate of the new doctrine, is upon the language employed in directing how an appeal is to be prosecuted. It is argued that where there has been no trial, strictly speaking, in the court below, there can be no appeal, because an appeal is the removal of a cause already decided, from the inferior to the superior judicatory; secondly, because it is said that all persons who have submitted to a trial have a right to appeal; thirdly, because the grounds of appeal are stated to be such as partiality, the refusal of testimony, haste or injustice in the decision; fourthly, because the book directs that, in hearing an appeal, the following steps are to be taken, viz. to read the sentence, then the reasons, then the records including the testimony, then to hear first the original parties, and afterwards the members of the inferior judicatory. If this argument is valid in relation to appeals, it is no less so in its application to complaints. For if an appeal is the removal of a cause already decided, so a complaint is "another method by which a cause decided in an inferior judicatory may be carried before a superior." The grounds of complaint contemplate "parties at the bar," injustice of the judgment, &c. The steps also in the prosecution of a complaint are substantially the same as in case of appeal; the sentence is to be read, then the reasons, then the records including the testimony, then the parties are to be

heard, &c. &c. The only difference between these modes of redress are the following. First, a complaint does not arrest the operation of the decision against which it is entered; and, secondly, an appeal can be made only by an aggrieved party; whereas a complaint can be made by any member of the court who disapproves of the decision. They do not differ at all as to the kind of decisions against which they are available. The same mode of arguing is equally applicable to the case of references. For a reference is defined to be a *judicial* representation of a case not yet decided. The superior judicatory, it is said, may remit the *cause* referred; and the inferior court is directed, in cases of reference, to send up all the testimony, in order that the higher court may consider and decide the case. It is evident, therefore, that we cannot, without the greatest inconsistency, stop half way in this matter. If the use of the words *cause*, *parties*, *testimony*, *sentence*, &c., under the head of appeals, shows that they must be confined to judicial cases; it proves the same with regard to complaints and references; and our whole system of government is overturned.

The fallacy of the above method of reasoning will appear from the following remarks. In the first place, these technical terms are to be understood, not according to their use in civil courts, but according to our own ecclesiastical usage. Our bodies are called courts; their decisions are called judgments; the matters brought before them are called cases. Are we to infer from this, as has been done by the new school lawyers and brethren, that they have nothing but judicial powers; that they are mere bodies for the administration of justice? The constitution says, indeed, that they are charged with the government of the churches; yet as civil courts have nothing to do with governing, it is insisted upon that ours can have nothing to do with it. This arguing from technical terms, and giving them a sense foreign to the peculiar nature of our ecclesiastical system, can produce nothing but confusion and embarrassment.

In the second place, our rules were drawn up with special reference to that class of cases which is of most frequent occurrence, and hence the language employed is adapted to such cases. Are we to infer, however, from the fact that the book directs the inferior judicatory, in cases of reference, to send up the testimony, that no case can be referred but one in which there is testimony to be presented? Yet this is the argument on which so much stress is laid. It is, that because

the rules, which relate to appeals, direct that the sentence should be read, and the testimony produced, there can be no appeal where there has not been a judicial sentence, and where there is no testimony. This is exactly the argument made on the floor of the Assembly in 1837 by Dr. Beman, in opposition to the motion to cite certain Synods to answer for their irregularities. He insisted that the Assembly should look at the book and abide by it to the letter. But to what part of the constitution did he refer the house? Not to that which contains the radical principles of our system, which enjoins on the higher courts to take effectual care that the constitution is observed, but to the rules of detail. And sure enough, as might have been expected, these rules do contemplate some specific erroneous decision, and consequently direct that the delinquent judicatory should be cited to show what it had done "in the case in question," after which the whole case was to be remitted to the said judicatory to be disposed of in a constitutional manner. It was hence argued that although the power of calling inferior courts to the bar, and seeing that they conformed to the constitution, was clearly recognised, yet the church had, by these rules of detail, effectually tied her own hands. A specific irregular act might be called up, and sent back for correction; but the Synods themselves were beyond the reach of the Assembly. They might cherish what disorders they pleased; recognise what churches or presbyteries they pleased, trample on the constitution as they pleased, the Assembly could do nothing but correct specific acts in detail. This argument is just as good as that which is now urged about appeals or complaints. The argument is, that the rules of process limit the exercise of the right to those particular cases, in which every one of the rules can be applied.

In the third place, it is a fallacy running through this argument that there can be no judicial investigation of any thing but a judicial act. An appeal or complaint is indeed a judicial process. Hence it is referred to the judicial committee; and the members of the court are warned, when it comes on for decision, that they are about to sit in their judicial capacity. This, however, proves nothing as to the nature of the act appealed from. The higher court is called to sit in judgment on the constitutionality, wisdom, or justice of a particular act of the court below; it matters not whether that act itself were judicial or executive. If any body was injured by it, he has a right to appeal from it, and have his brethren judge of its propriety. That our constitution con-

templated such appeals is evident from the fact that it provides that an appeal shall suspend the operation of the decision appealed from, except it be a sentence of suspension, excommunication, or deposition. This is just as much as to say, except in judicial cases; for suspension, excommunication, and deposition are the only sentences, worth naming, which our courts are competent to pass. If then these are excepted from arrest in their operation by an appeal, all are excepted, unless an appeal may lie from other than strictly judicial decisions. It is evident, therefore, that such decisions form but one class of those acts from which an appeal can be taken.

Finally, if it can be shown that all the requisitions of the book may be fully complied with in cases of appeals from executive acts, then there is an end of the argument; as the whole argument rests on the supposed incompatibility of those rules with such appeals. Let us take for illustration either of the appeals presented in 1835 by Thomas Bradford and others. The presbytery had divided the 5th church of Philadelphia against its will, erecting two new churches, and giving a name to neither. The church felt itself aggrieved; it believed that not only the spiritual interests of the congregation, but the title to the property was injuriously affected by the decision. They had therefore the right not only to have it reviewed, but arrested. They accordingly appealed. The papers were referred to the judicial committee, and found to be in order. When the case was to be tried, the Assembly was duly warned that it was about to sit in a judicial capacity, to decide on the constitutionality and justice of that act of the presbytery. The first step was to read the sentence, or decision appealed from; the second to read the reasons of the appeal. The third to read the record in the case, including the testimony. The testimony in this case was all the evidence presented to the presbytery to prove the opposition of the church to the division. Fourth step was to hear the original parties. The only parties in the case were the presbytery who had done the wrong and the church that suffered it. They were accordingly heard. The fifth step, according to the book, would be to hear the members of the inferior judicatory. This direction was complied with in taking the fourth step, the presbytery being one of the parties. Thus every direction of the book was complied with, in this, as in a hundred similar cases of appeal from executive acts. It would be mere trifling to say that the

directions were not all followed, because there were not two original parties distinct from the presbytery. There never are such parties, even in judicial cases, when the ground of prosecution is common fame. Besides, had this appeal been carried in the first instance to the Synod, and there decided against the appellants, then the original parties in this case would have been the church and the presbytery, and the members of the Synod, the members of the inferior judicatory whom the book directs to be heard in the fifth step of the trial. Thus the whole rule would have been complied with to the letter.* There is, therefore, no foundation in our constitution for this new doctrine. Every letter of the rules may be, and has been fully complied with in a multitude of cases, where the decision appealed from was merely an executive act.

It may be said, however, that it is very desirable to have appeals confined if possible to strictly judicial cases; that it is unreasonable that the executive acts of a body should be arrested by any dissatisfied member. This objection, however, overlooks the fact that no merely dissatisfied member has a right to appeal. That remedy is expressly confined to a person or persons directly affected by a decision. If a minister is tried before his presbytery for an offence and condemned, if he does not choose to appeal, no dissatisfied member can do it. And if he is acquitted, no member of the court, however he may disapprove of the decision, can appeal; his remedy is to complain. But if a presbytery dismiss a pastor, against his will, from his charge, as he is directly affected by the act, he may appeal from it: or if they divide a church, the church may appeal. The right of appeal is limited, therefore, not to a particular class of decisions, but to a particular class of persons, viz. to those who are injuriously affected by the decision.

* It is perhaps to be regretted that the inferior judicatory should ever be regarded, in cases of complaint or appeal, as a party. This however is a designation which the judicatory bears as much when the sentence appealed from is a judicial, as when it is an executive act. If a minister is accused by any particular person of an offence before his presbytery and is condemned, should he appeal, the accuser and the accused are properly the parties, when the case come before the Synod; and the presbytery is not properly a party. But if the prosecution is on the ground of common fame, then as far as there are original parties at all, they are the accused and the presbytery from whose sentence he appeals. Whatever impropriety there may be in calling the inferior court a party, it has nothing to do with the present question. The court is no more a party in cases of appeal, when its decision was executive, than when it was judicial.

We have, however, acted long enough upon the defensive. We shall proceed to show that this new doctrine, especially if applied to complaints as well as appeals, (and we have seen that the two cannot in this matter be consistently separated,) is subversive of the fundamental principles of presbyterianism, and inconsistent with the uniform practice of the church. It is a radical principle of our system "that a larger part of the church, or a representation of it, should govern a smaller, or determine matters of controversy which arise therein." It is in virtue of this principle that every man who is aggrieved or injured by a decision of a lower court has the right to seek redress in a higher. He has the right to bring the matter up himself, and is not dependent on the majority of the body, whether it shall come up or not. It is further a fundamental principle of our system that any thing which has been unconstitutionally or injuriously done in a lower court, whether it affect an individual or not, may be corrected by a higher court. This is of the essence of presbyterianism. It is involved in the declaration that the church is to be governed not only by congregational and presbyterial, but also by synodical assemblies; and more expressly in the declaration that Synods have authority "to redress whatever has been done by presbyteries contrary to order." It is evident that any interpretation of words and phrases occurring in rules regulating details in the administration of discipline, which comes into conflict with these radical principles of our system, must be rejected as false and unwarranted. The new doctrine is liable to this fatal objection. It effectually prevents the exercise of control on the part of the higher courts, and renders the lower judicatories independent as to all their executive acts, which included the larger and perhaps most important part of their proceedings. A presbytery may trample on the constitution with impunity; it may admit congregationalists to sit as ruling elders; it may receive ministers without requiring them to adopt our standards; it may dismiss a pastor against his own will and that of his people; it may, for party purposes, divide a congregation contrary to its wishes, or instal a pastor over them in spite of their remonstrances; and for these and a multitude of similar cases there is no redress, if the right to complain and appeal is to be confined to judicial cases. The review of records affords no remedy at all in nine out of ten of such instances. The records contain a bare statement of the facts, that such a man was received, such a pastor dismissed, such

an one installed, or such a congregation divided, but whether these acts were constitutionally performed, they give no means of judging. They afford, therefore, nothing on which the higher court can lay hold. Besides, by withholding their records, it would be in the power of the inferior judicatory to prevent all knowledge of their irregularities, even in those few cases in which the minutes might disclose them.

It may be said that *fama clamosa* affords ground for calling the offending judicatory to an account. But, in the first place, this is a remedy which applies only in extreme cases. And, in the second, this would be doing by indirection what ought to be done decently and in order. A minority grieved by the unconstitutional or injurious acts of the majority, not having the right to make an orderly representation of the case to the higher court, is driven to make a clamour about it, in order to attract their attention. This surely is not presbyterianism. And besides, the citation and trial of judicatories, on the ground of common fame, is the most invidious, the most cumbrous, and the least effectual of all methods for the correction of abuses. If therefore the right of appeal and complaint be taken away, except in judicial cases, there is no remedy for the largest and most important class of unconstitutional or unjust acts of ecclesiastical bodies. Our new school brethren have never brought forward a principle more completely subversive of presbyterian government than the new doctrine, in its full extent, would certainly be. It would effectually prevent the legitimate operation of our system; it would place the constitution, order and purity of the church at the mercy of any one Presbytery, and leave minorities completely in the hands of majorities.

It may be said that these remarks apply only to that form of the new doctrine which excludes complaints, no less than appeals, in all except judicial cases. We have already admitted that the evil is far less sweeping, if the right of complaining against unconstitutional or injurious executive acts be allowed to remain. But the right of appeal is no less sacred than that of complaint. The constitution places them on the same ground, as far as the present subject of debate is concerned. The Assembly has no more authority to take away the one, than it has to take away the other. The argument which has been applied to justify the denial of the right to appeal, except in judicial cases, applies in all its force to complaints. It is proper, therefore, to show what would be the effect of the full assertion of the new doctrine. Besides, the

evil arising from denying the right of appeal where the constitution allows it, is no less real and grievous, though less extensive than when the denial is extended to complaints. A man dismissed from his charge, a congregation divided, or over whom a pastor has been installed against its consent, have a right not merely to have these acts reviewed, but their operation arrested. And it is often of the last importance that the effect of the decision should be suspended until a final determination can be had. The reversal of a presbyterial decision to divide a congregation, after it had actually been organized for nearly a year into two parts, would often aggravate, instead of healing the difficulty. And so, in a multitude of other cases, of which abundant examples might be cited from the minutes. This new doctrine, therefore, is inconsistent with the radical principles of presbyterianism, and its full operation effectually subverts our whole form of government; and even in its restricted application to appeals, it is in direct conflict with the constitutional rights of aggrieved parties, and productive of much injustice and hardship.

This doctrine is at variance also with the undeviating practice of our own and all other presbyterian churches. This of itself is a fatal objection to any new doctrine. The fact that we have been going on in accordance with the usage of all other presbyterian bodies, for an hundred and twenty years, interpreting and administering our constitution in a certain way, is answer enough to any man, who comes forward with a new doctrine, extracted by legal subtlety from the technicalities of the constitution. The words of our book have the sense which they were intended to bear; and they were intended to bear the sense in which its authors and administrators have ever understood and applied them. If we depart from this rule of construction we might as well have no constitution at all. Stability is one of the primary requisites of good government. And hence it is a great evil that any long established principle should be unsettled by some novel interpretation of our fundamental laws. That the practice of our church has been uniform on this subject, is admitted. It is maintained, however, that this usage, as far as concerns the period anterior to the revision of the constitution in 1821, is of no authority, and that the time which has since elapsed is too short to give to usage any force in opposition to what is supposed to be the sense of the constitution. This principle is no doubt correct. Usage is not of authority in opposition to a written constitution. But it is of the

greatest authority in a question of interpretation. It cannot be rightfully disregarded, unless the constitution be clearly in opposition to the usage. We have already seen that there is no such opposition in the present case; that the uniform practice of the church is in harmony with our constitutional rules. This being the case, the argument from usage is of course conclusive.

The assumption that the amendments adopted in 1821 were designed to abrogate the old common law of the church is a very extraordinary one. This common law had grown up, in this country and in Scotland, under the brief and aphoristic statement of presbyterian principles contained in the Westminster Directory. These statements were incorporated in the constitution of 1788, and are retained in the amended constitution of 1821. If from that time they were to be differently understood, it is strange that they were not so modified as to give some intimation of the fact. But how is it known that these amendments were *intended* to abrogate the old common law of the church? The authors of the amendments declare, some in one way and some in another, that they had no such intention. The church certainly intended no such change, because it went on acting under the amended constitution precisely as it had acted before. It was not until fifteen years after the amendments were made, that any one discovered what they were intended to accomplish. It is evident that such a discovery cannot be entitled to much consideration.

To show how uniform has been the usage of our church on this subject, even since 1821, we shall proceed to cite some of the examples to be found on our minutes; and for reasons already stated, we shall not confine these examples to cases of appeals. In 1822, the Assembly entertained and decided an appeal from the synod of Ohio, relating to the validity of the election of certain elders. *Minutes*, p. 18 and 21. In 1827, Dr. Green and others presented a complaint against a decision of the synod of Philadelphia, which turned on the question, Whether the same person could properly hold the office of ruling elder in two churches at the same time? The decision of the synod was affirmed, p. 117. Two other complaints of a similar character were decided the same year, p. 125, 130, and 132. In 1828, an appeal was received from some of the pew-holders of the first church in Troy against a decision of the synod of Albany, p. 228; and a complaint from the presbytery of Philadelphia against the

presbytery of Columbia, relating to the licensure of Mr. Shaffer, p. 234. In 1829, two complaints were received against decisions which were not judicial. In 1830, an appeal was presented from the church in Bergen from a decision of the synod of Genesee, which, however, was dismissed for want of a date and other irregularities in the mode of its prosecution, p. 9 and 17. In 1831, the complaint of the minority of the presbytery of Philadelphia, in the case of Mr. Barnes, was presented; and in 1832, a complaint against a decision of the synod of Virginia relating to called meetings of synod, p. 315. In 1832, there appear to have been five, if not six, complaints of the same character presented to the Assembly, p. 476. In 1834, the Assembly received and decided the appeal of the second presbytery of Philadelphia against the decision of the Synod, before referred to. The same year the synod of Philadelphia referred for adjudication the appeal and complaint of the fifth church of Philadelphia relative to the call of Dr. Beman, p. 8. In 1835, the Assembly received and decided the appeal of Thomas Bradford and others from a decision of the second presbytery dividing their church, p. 20; and also an appeal and complaint of Thomas Bradford and others relating to the installation of Mr. Duffield, when the acts of the presbytery in relation thereto were reversed, p. 33. Immediately under the record of this latter decision we find the following minute, viz. "The Assembly took up the report of the committee on the records of the synod of Philadelphia, and the records were approved with the following exception, viz. In regard to the doctrine of the said synod concerning appeals, complaints and protests, and the application of this doctrine, about which the Assembly express no opinion." There was the less necessity for expressing an opinion in words, as they had just expressed one so intelligibly, by acting in direct opposition to that doctrine. In 1836, we find several examples of the same kind, as, for instance, the appeal and complaint of the second presbytery against the synod of Philadelphia for dissolving them as a presbytery, p. 273. In 1837, there was an appeal presented by Rev. A. G. Morss and others, of the congregation of Frankford, which does not appear to have related to a judicial decision, p. 417 and 480. In 1838, there was an unusual number of such complaints and appeals: for example, a complaint by the presbytery of Wilmington; a protest and complaint by R. J. Breckinridge and others against the synod of Philadelphia for their decision relating to the third presby-

tery of Philadelphia; an appeal and complaint of J. Campbell and others against a decision of the synod of New Jersey; an appeal and complaint of certain persons claiming to be the church of St. Charles, against a decision of the synod of Missouri, that they were not the said church; which appeal was sustained, and the proceedings of the synod in the case were set aside. See pages 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23, and 39 of the Minutes.

There is not then, upon our minutes, a single case of an appeal or complaint, which was rejected on the ground that it did not refer to a judicial sentence. We have been going on for a hundred and twenty years entertaining such appeals without any one dreaming of their being irregular. This has been done as freely since, as before, the revision of the constitution, by those who proposed and by those who adopted the amendments. If after all this a new and opposite doctrine is to be introduced, there never can be any stability or security with regard to any principle of presbyterian church government. If precedents so long continued, so numerous, so highly sanctioned, are to be set aside, the church will demand something more than verbal criticism, or ingenious inferences from collated passages. Nothing short of a plain and intelligible denial of the right to complaint of oppressive and unconstitutional acts; or to appeal from unrighteous decisions, though they may not be judicial, will induce presbyterians to forego a privilege which they have enjoyed from the very foundation of their church. No one pretends that there is any such denial to be found in our amended constitution. The prohibition is a mere inference from the technicalities of the rules of process. We think, however, that we have shown that there is no such opposition between our rules of process and the radical principles of our system; that every one of those rules may be observed to the very letter, in cases of appeal or complaint against executive acts, and consequently that there is no foundation in the constitution for this new doctrine. If it is to be applied to appeals, we see not how any one can fail to apply it to complaints and references, and if so applied, all must acknowledge that our system of government would be completely overturned. The right of appeal is already restricted within very narrow limits. It is not the privilege of any member of the court. It belongs exclusively to an aggrieved party; to those whose character or interests are immediately concerned in the deci-

sion. And to all such it is a right guarantied by the constitution and by the undeviating practice of the church.

Day of Thanksgiving.

Dr. J. Breckinridge offered a series of resolutions in relation to the appointment of a day of thanksgiving; which were amended and adopted as follows, viz.

“Whereas, by the great grace of God, our beloved church has now completed the fiftieth year since the organization of the General Assembly; and whereas, during that eventful and most interesting period she has experienced, notwithstanding all her unworthiness, extraordinary mercies of manifold kinds; and whereas, this great cycle in her history has been characterized by a series of remarkable deliverances from imminent dangers which threatened her purity, her peace, her Christian order, and sacred liberty; therefore,

“1st. Resolved, That the second Lord’s day of December next be, and it is hereby appointed a day to be observed with religious solemnity by all our people, in celebrating the praises of God, and in rendering thanks to his great name for all his mercies.

“2d. Resolved, That it be earnestly recommended to all the pastors and other preachers of the gospel under the care of this General Assembly, to convene all the people on that day, to instruct them more fully in the history of those great events in which we rejoice, and to invite them to acts of personal, public, and united praise to God.

3d. Resolved, That the name of the Board for the publication of Tracts and Sabbath-school Books be changed to the name of the Presbyterian Board of Publication; and that its constitution be so altered as to require said Board to publish not only Tracts and Sabbath school books, but also approved works in support of the great principles of the Reformation, as exhibited in the doctrines and order of the Presbyterian Church, and whatever else the Assembly may direct.

4th. Resolved, That as a timely and open expression of the Church’s gratitude, it be recommended that either by public collections, or in some other way approved and in use among the people, every member of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, be called to “offer gifts,” for the glory of God, and the good of man, and that the same be remitted to the Treasurer of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, and that the thank-offering of the people of God made at said semi-centenary celebration, be appropriated to the object contemplated in the above resolutions under the direction of the said Board.

5th. Resolved, That a committee of one from each Synod represented in this General Assembly, be appointed to address a circular letter to the Churches, explaining the objects of the above resolutions, inviting their universal and cordial co-operation—and also calling on all the Presbyteries and Synods in our connexion, to take action on this important subject at their next stated meeting.

6th. Resolved, That nothing in the foregoing resolutions shall be so construed as to prevent any individuals that may prefer it, from directing their thank-offering to the erection of buildings for the use of the General Assembly and its Boards in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Louisville.

This subject elicited a diversity of opinion, not as to the object itself, for on this great unanimity prevailed, but as to the time and manner of observing the anniversary in question, and more especially as to the objects to which the funds which might be collected on this occasion should be applied.

Some were in favour of placing the funds at the disposal of the next General Assembly; others wished that an equal division should be made among the several Boards under the direction of the Assembly; others, that a publishing fund should be created; and others, that the monies should be appropriated for the erection of commodious buildings in Philadelphia and New York for accommodations for the different Boards and for the Assembly itself; while one venerable father from the West thought it would be more wise to expend the money in the erection of churches in destitute parts of the country. Notwithstanding this diversity of opinion, we believe there was a general acquiescence in the resolutions as finally adopted.

It may be that as the idea of this semi-centenary celebration is new to most of our churches, they may not appreciate the subject, nor take sufficient interest in the success of the enterprise. The result, therefore, must depend very much on the zeal which the clergy manifest on the occasion. It will be necessary that the attention of the people should be early called to the subject; that they should have clearly presented to them the great mercies of God towards our church during the last fifty years; the reasonableness of publicly acknowledging those mercies, and the warrant we have from scriptural usage for such celebrations; and the importance of the objects to be aided or accomplished by their thank-offerings. Should there be any who doubt of the wisdom of these recommendations, they must notwithstanding, out of respect to the General Assembly, to the honour of the church, and the undeniable importance of the objects to be attained, take a lively interest in the success of the plan. All must be prepared to say, as it is to be done, let it be done well.

Ministers without charge.

The committee on the overture respecting ministers without charge, made a report, which was indefinitely postponed, and the Assembly resolved, That the resolution adopted by the General Assembly in 1802, in relation to ministers without charge, be republished in the printed minutes. It is as follows, viz.

“Resolved, That it is a principle of this Church, that no minister of the gospel can be regularly divested of his office, except by a course of discipline terminating in his deposition; that if any minister, by providential circumstances, become incapable of exercising his ministerial functions, or is called to suspend them, or to exercise them only occasionally, he is still to be considered as fully possessing the ministerial character and privileges; and his brethren of the

Presbytery are to inspect his conduct; and while they treat him with due tenderness and sympathy, they are to be careful that he do not neglect ministerial duty, beyond what his circumstances render unavoidable:—That if any minister of the Gospel, through a worldly spirit, a disrelish for the duties of his office, or any other criminal motive, become negligent or careless, he is by no means to be suffered to pursue this course, so as at length to be permitted to lay aside the ministry without censure; because this would be to encourage a disregard of the most solemn obligations, by opening a way to escape from them with impunity. But in all such cases, Presbyteries are seasonably to use the means, and pursue the methods pointed out in the word of God and the rules of this Church, to recall their offending brother to a sense of duty; and if all their endeavours be ineffectual, they are at length regularly to exclude or depose him from his office.

“If any cases or questions relative to this subject shall arise in Presbyteries, which are not contemplated by the provisions of this rule, such cases or questions should be referred to the General Assembly for a special decision.—1802.”

Our readers may remember that this subject was brought before the Assembly of 1835, and referred to a committee, who reported in favour of denying to ministers without a pastoral charge the right of sitting in any judicatory as members. After some discussion the matter was referred to a committee to report to the next Assembly; that committee reported in 1836 that its members had not been able to agree. And there, we believe, the matter rested. This certainly is a subject of growing importance. The increase of such ministers in our church is so great as to call for serious attention; whether the resolution above quoted will be sufficient to arrest or correct the evil, time must show.

Presbytery of Hudson.

Dr. Plumer introduced the following motion; Whereas it has come to the knowledge of the General Assembly that difficulties have arisen in the Presbytery of Hudson, which have led some of its members to depart from the Presbyterian church, therefore, *Resolved*, That the Presbytery of Hudson be directed at its first meeting to purge its roll.

It appears that a small minority of this presbytery seceded last fall, and formed themselves into a new presbytery, retaining however their old name. Before this secession the presbytery was entitled to send four commissioners to the General Assembly; after it, they were entitled to send but two. Still as the names of these seceding members were yet on the roll, and the Assembly giving the presbytery credit for sincerity in deeming it wise and prudent to delay striking off the names of those members; and as one of the commissioners had already withdrawn; and the facts in the case were not brought to the

knowledge of the house until near the close of its sessions, the Assembly considered it sufficient to adopt the above cited resolution. Against the decision Messrs. W. L. Breckinridge, Steele, Junkin and Lyle protested, on the ground that as the secession had been public and notorious, the presbytery was bound at once to erase the names of the seceders, and had no right to estimate them as members in making out their delegates to the Assembly; and consequently that the Assembly ought, as soon as it had satisfactory knowledge of the facts, to have taken more efficient measures for correcting the impropriety with which the presbytery was chargeable.

The course adopted by the presbytery of Hudson is certainly to be regretted, as it has at least the appearance of unfairness, which we are bound to avoid as well as the reality. It is no sufficient apology that the opposite party acted on the same principle; that the little seceding minority sent four members to the New School Assembly; that the secession of the presbytery of Troy sent four; or that of Cincinnati sent a double representation. It is better to suffer such things than to do them. The reader will be surprised also in looking over the roll of the New Assembly at the number of presbyteries of which he never heard before, as for example, Marshall, Washtenaw, Kalamazoo, Ripley, Knox, Hiwassee, New River. We believe these are all new presbyteries formed since the schism.

The Assembly having finished its business, it was resolved, that this General Assembly be dissolved: and that another General Assembly, chosen in like manner, be required to meet in the seventh or Assembly church, in the city of Philadelphia, on the third Thursday of May, 1840, at 11 o'clock A.M. The moderator dissolved the Assembly accordingly with prayer, singing, and the apostolic benediction. Thus ended one of the most harmonious and pleasant sessions of the General Assembly, which the church has seen for many years. We trust it is the beginning of better days.

QUARTERLY LIST

OF

NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Missionary Fanaticism opposed to Christian Zeal: A Discourse, delivered in St. John's Church, Brooklyn, Feb. 24, 1839, the Festival of St. Matthias. With explanatory notes. By Evan M. Johnson, Rector. Published at the request of the Missionary Committee of said church. The profits to be given to Bishop Chave's College, in Illinois. New York: Protestant Episcopal Press, 8vo. pp. 32. 1839.

We have before had occasion, more than once, to speak of the Rector of St. John's, Brooklyn, and of his opinions in terms of no very profound respect; but in this discourse he "plays such pranks" before the public, as we had not been prepared to expect even from *him*. In his estimation, missionary zeal, as now exercised by the leading religious denominations in the United States, not excepting his own, is mere "fanaticism;" the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions has effected "almost nothing;" the American Bible Society is a "signal failure;" and an immediate "reconciliation" between the Roman Catholic and Greek churches, and the Protestant Episcopal in England and this country is not only practicable but desirable! Such ignorance, or forgetfulness of the apostolic example in spreading the gospel; such shameful misrepresentations of various public bodies; and such blind and silly prejudices against every thing out of the pale of Episcopacy—as are to be found in this discourse, can be accounted for only on the principle that the author has laid an embargo on his understanding. We notice such an unworthy ephemeral, only for the purpose of letting our readers see what a man who calls himself a Protestant Episcopalian is capable of.

It is not *true* that the American Bible Society "made a pledge, that every family *in the world* should have a bible within a given time." It is not *true* that that noble institution has done nothing to *reduce the price* of bibles. It has done much, as every intelligent observer knows. It is not *true* that that Society "distributes few, very few bibles *gratuitously*." It has thus distributed many thousand every year since it was founded. It is not *true* that—but we forbear to pursue further the raving of sectarian fanaticism.

Address delivered before the Philomathean Society of the University of Pennsylvania, Thursday, November 1st, 1838. By William B. Reed. Philadelphia: T. K. and P. G. Collins, 8vo. pp. 62. 1838.

This is an interesting and instructive address. The author is a highly respectable member of the Philadelphia bar, and was, under the late administration in Pennsylvania, attorney general of the state. He is a son of the patriotic Governor Reed, of revolutionary memory, whose zeal and services in the great contest which severed us from the mother country, secured him a high place among contemporary heroes; and whose noble answer, in 1778, to an artful suggestion, conveyed through a lady, while he was a member of congress, of gaining his influence in favour of a reconciliation with the parent government by bribery, is so extensively and honourably remembered—"Madam, I am not worth purchasing; but such as I am, the king of Great Britain is not rich enough to do it."

The interesting topic chosen by Mr. Reed as the subject of this address, is peculiarly in keeping with his ancestry and his early training. It is "the origin of our Revolutionary Union—the recorded and traditional history of acts and influences that led to the convocation of the first continental congress, which met in Philadelphia, in the month of September, 1774." It will be at once perceived that it was impossible to do full justice to this theme in the compass of a single address. But the author has taken a clear, comprehensive, and striking view of it; has given the general outline with a strong hand; and exhibited the events and the noble-minded men of the period in question in a manner adapted to thrill the bosoms of those who have any portion of the patriotism and the valour which so highly distinguished that period. He has selected his materials with much judgment, and presented them in a style characterised by elegance and vigour.

When we took up this truly valuable pamphlet, we felt some curiosity as to the manner in which Mr. Reed would dispose of the *religious denominations and sentiments* which are well known to have exerted much influence in the commencement and prosecution of our revolutionary contest. Here again we were gratified to find him well informed, impartial and faithful. He does full justice to the Presbyterians, and to the descendants of the Puritans in New England, and fairly draws the line between that part of the Episcopal church which adhered to the British government, and that important portion which, with decision and zeal, took the patriotic side. We wish we had room for an extract of three or four pages which treat of this subject.

We are pleased with the example of Mr. Reed in his choice of a subject. Too many of the gentlemen who are called upon to address the literary societies in our colleges and universities, construct their addresses rather on the principle of rhetorical display, than of solid and permanent instruction. Had Mr. Reed proceeded upon this plan, who would have read his "address" a second time, or thought it worth binding with his precious documents? But as it is, we venture to say, that it will be read by many more than once, and a number of years hence. We would respectfully suggest to those who may be called upon to

address the undergraduates and alumni of our colleges in time to come, the great advantage of each one selecting in his turn, some great event, or some distinguished literary, scientific or professional character, and making the history of that event, or the portrait of his hero, the main subject of his address, drawing from either such lessons of instruction or warning, as the character or occasion may dictate. Who that was called to such a service might not present the history of some particular college, or other literary institution; or make such a use of the character of Cicero, of Demosthenes, of Justinian, of Erasmus, of Grotius, of Bacon, of Chatham, or of some American hero, whose name is connected with a thousand patriotic associations—as should be adapted to secure permanent utility? Such a plan would shut out the method of stringing together the mere common places of sentiment and verbiage. It would be to make every such address a valuable document, embodying and recording that which would turn to important account hereafter, for the historian, the scholar, or the moralist.

Abolition a Sedition. By a Northern Man. Philadelphia, 1839.

Memoirs of the Rev. Samuel Munson and the Rev. Henry Lyman, late Missionaries to the Indian Archipelago; with the Journal of their Exploring Tour. By the Rev. William Thompson. New York, 1839.

Outline of the Work of Grace in the Presbyterian Congregation at New Brunswick, N. J. during the year 1837. By Joseph H. Jones, Pastor of the Sixth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, 12mo. pp. 148. 1839.

Mr. Jones has discharged a duty which he owed to the Christian community by this account of a remarkable visitation of divine grace with which the people of his charge were favoured. It is a simple and unpretending work, presenting many interesting facts, and conveying much valuable instruction, in a style at once finished and forcible.

A Winter in the West Indies; containing general observations upon modes of Travelling, Manners and Customs, Climate and Productions; with a particular description of St. Croix, Trinidad de Cuba, Havana, Key West, and St. Augustine, as places of resort for northern invalids. By an Invalid, in 1 Vol. 12mo.

Narrative of a journey to Gautemala in Central America, in 1838; by G. W. Montgomery, Esq. 1 Vol. 8vo.

Christian Consistency, or the Connexion between Experimental and Practical Religion Designed for Young Christians. By the Rev. E. Mannering, of Holywell Mount Chapel. Philadelphia. 1839.

We have already expressed a favourable opinion of this work. We are glad that the "Presbyterian Board of Publication" have been induced to re-publish it.

A Residence in the Sandwich Islands. By C. S. Stewart, U. S. N. Late Missionary at the Sandwich Islands, Fifth Edition, enlarged. Including an Introduction and Notes. By Rev. William Ellis. Boston. 1839.

Mr. Stewart is one of our best descriptive writers. There are few who excel

him in the liveliness and ease with which he presents to the reader the scenes through which he has passed. This new and enlarged edition of his residence in the Sandwich Islands is peculiarly welcome at the present moment, when the lively interest, so long and so justly cherished by the Christian community for those Islands is receiving, in the providence of God, a new and heightened impulse, by tidings of unprecedented displays of His mercy and grace, in the hopeful conversion of multitudes of sinners on those distant shores. This volume, the author informs us, is the first of a series, of which an enlarged edition of his visit to the South Seas, will constitute the second and third volumes, and a new work, the fourth; the whole intended to illustrate the origin, progress, and present state of the mission to the Sandwich Islands.

The Signs of the Times: a Series of Discourses Delivered in the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. By Cornelius C. Cuyler, D.D. Pastor of the Church. Philadelphia, 1839.

These discourses give evidence of the care and judiciousness which would be expected from their author. The instruction which they contain is sound and seasonable.

The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America, by Charles Hodge, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. Part I. 1705 to 1741. Philadelphia, 1839. pp. 256. 8vo.

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1839.

No. IV.

- ART. I.—1. *The Intermediate State: a Sermon by the Rev. Reuben Sherwood of Hyde Park.* New York, pp. 18. Appendix, pp. 42.
2. *No Intermediate Place: a Sermon delivered in the Reformed Dutch Church in Hyde Park, by the Rev. William Cruikshanks,* pp. 22.

THE discourse of Mr. Cruikshanks is a brief, plain, straightforward, honest and manly illustration of the doctrine of an intermediate *state* of departed souls; with a refutation of the doctrine of an intermediate *place* of the dead. Mr. C. goes forth into the field to meet a challenge; and he goes with his sling and the smooth stones of the brook, although he is not a Goliath that he has to encounter. He goes forth with his Bible, and tells us what God's word has declared in reference to the state of departed souls.

That there is no intermediate *place*, he argues from the plain statements of the holy Scriptures; from the fact that it is contrary to all the desires and expectations of the people of God; that it is contrary to their approved faith; that it is in direct opposition to the case stated by our Lord, in his parable of Dives and Lazarus; and to the holy visions of the

saints in heaven, as seen by the apostle John. And he closes by reviewing the leading objections lately offered to this doctrine of the church of Christ, and making a touching appeal to the hearts of his audience.

The discourse of Mr. Sherwood we shall not attempt to criticise in detail. It sets criticism at defiance. No man of taste can endure the vulgarity of his style. Besides, Mr. S. has yet to study the theology of the best fathers of his own church; and in a special manner the subject which he has undertaken to discuss. He hastens to teach others, before he has himself studied the topic of discussion. He hurries into his subject without definitions or explanations. Hence he sails, the whole of his voyage, under false colours. He styles his discourse, "*The Intermediate State.*" Now, no one belonging to the Reformed Churches, questions the fact of an intermediate *state*. But, under this erroneous title, and thence by erroneous arguments, does he actually labour, all the while, to establish the doctrine of An Intermediate PLACE!

His main argument, and we venture to call it the *πρωτον ψευδος* of his theory, is this: "There is a general judgment at the last day, when the saints are made perfect in holiness and happiness. This he fortifies with much vigour and anxiety, as if his Christian opponents really doubted it. Thence he draws the profound inferences, that, *therefore*, there is no particular judgment at their death; *therefore*, the believer does not depart *in holiness* at death; and, *therefore*, not one soul enters heaven until the final day of judgment; because they are all made perfect in holiness and perfect in happiness only at the last day! This single assumption is pressed in to sustain his whole theory. Hence he gravely collects many passages of holy writ, and many scraps of wisdom from the fathers of the church, to prove, irrefragably, what no sober man ever denied; namely, that the saints are really, and truly, and most certainly made perfect in happiness and glory at the last day.* Hence, feeling the laurels of victory already on his head, he shouts victory in simply drawing the eventful inference,—that, therefore,

* In his various quotations, we perceive that whenever he finds an author, or the creed of a Church admitting that the saints are made perfect in happiness and complete in glory *at the last day*,—these he is sure to press in to his support. Hence he quotes even the Confession of the Reformed Dutch Church. Sherw. Disc. Append. p. 51. 54. And he can also discover his doctrine in the Westminster Confession! Append. p. 59.

there is no particular judgment or decision at the believer's death; that no one is made perfect in holiness at death; and that no one enters into *any degree* of glory in heaven at death, for the most manifest reason, that they enter into *perfect* glory and happiness in heaven at the last day." This is the amount of the puerile and unanswerable logic of the Reverend Rector of St. James, at Hyde Park!

Having by this unique and matchless logic, more "mysterious than Geneva logic," dislodged the saints from heaven; and having brought quotations from the creed of the Reformed Dutch Church, the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches, and from ancient and modern fathers, as witnesses, all uttering as he supposes the same sentence of exclusion against the saints, he proceeds to lay down his theory. And it cannot boast of originality in his hands. It is a meagre gleanings from the pages of bishops Seabury and Hobart. It is this:—*First*, The souls of believers are *not* made perfect in holiness at death. *Second*, They are not received immediately into heaven, in happiness and glory. As they depart *not* in perfect holiness, they depart, of course, in their sins still cleaving to them. And they go "into the lower parts of the earth;"—"into a place out of heaven," and "apart from heaven;" they "are in the prison, whither *Christ went and preached to the spirits in prison*;"* and that place and prison is "NOT heaven, but paradise." Sherwood's Disc. pp. 6, 7, 13, &c.

In the history of the theological opinions respecting the state of departed souls, we discover a great variety. And many of them diverge widely from the plain and explicit doctrine of the Holy Scriptures on this point. The Spirit of God has declared that the Old Testament saints died in the faith of Christ; that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were in the kingdom of heaven, in the days of our Lord, and before his death and descent into the invisible world. Math. viii. 11, that the righteous entered into peace; and while their bodies "rested in their beds," of the grave, "each one of them was walking in his uprightness." Isaiah lvii. 1, 2, that "*the dead do all live to God*:" and, finally, that the departed saints are "the spirits of just men made perfect," Luke xx. 37, 38. Heb. xii. 23. Such was the doctrine of the ancient church of God.

* Thus our Rector actually avows his faith in the Popish Limbus of the Fathers.

Those nations who were not within the pale of the visible church, but had gone “forth from the presence of the Lord,” soon lost the very tradition of this primitive doctrine. This is evident from the remaining writings and fragments of the most ancient classic writers; and of those that are less ancient. And from the time when the Hebrews mingled with heathen during the seventy years captivity; and, especially, after their doctors had been gradually corrupted by the theories of the Greek philosophers under the Grecian empire, and, finally, under the Roman empire, their sentiments on this point began to differ more and more widely from the doctrines of their sacred writings, and the faith of their fore-fathers. They seem to have adopted the fictions of their conquerors on this point. They conceived that departed souls are placed in different local habitations, or *places*, adapted to their characters. Many of them evidently adopted the doctrine of the transmigration of souls into other bodies. Hence that question put by the Jews,—“Who sinned; this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?” Hence their opinions about our Lord, that he was Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the old prophets in another form and body! Hence that remarkable expression in the book of Wisdom, written by a Jew, who had been corrupted by the philosophy of Pythagoras,—“I was a witty child, and had a good spirit; yea, rather, being good, *I came into a body undefiled.*”*

Others supposed, with the Platonists, that the soul, having departed from the material and gross body, went into a *place* called by the heathen writers, the Elysian fields; but by the Jewish doctors,—“the habitations and places adapted to the pure soul:” that it there had an ethereal, or aeriform body; but that it never was again to be re-united to the body by a resurrection. These Pharisees did, indeed, use the word *ἀναστασις*, which is usually rendered “resurrection.” But, as Dr. Campbell has proved by a quotation out of Josephus, all that even the Pharisees intended by the *ἀναστασις τῶν νεκρῶν*, was simply the existence of the soul in a future state; and the transmigration of the soul into other bodies.†

As the Platonic doctrine gained ground in the primitive Christian ages, this sentiment of course gained ground, that the immortal soul, in order to its being perfectly happy in Elysium, must be stript of its gross material body. St. Au-

* See John ix. 2. Wisdom viii. 19, 20. Campb. Dissert. VI. Part II.

† See Campb. Diss. VI. Part II. Sect. 19. Josephus, Antiq. Book 18, ch. 2, &c.

gustine inveighed with vehemence against this Platonic innovation, as a doctrine clearly militating against the divine doctrine of the resurrection of the body from the dead.* These denunciations fell with justice on those "*Christian fathers*," the Platonic philosophers, who had embraced Christianity in appearance; but who, in reality, had not put off Plato, nor the old man; but had put the mask of Christianity over them. Plato, and his genuine followers, admitted that the departed soul had a body; but not a material body. That body, once sunk into the grave, was never to be recalled from the dust. The bodies in which they clothed the happy souls in Elysium were, as we have seen, aeriform, or ethereal bodies.

The platonizing Christian adopted this theory, without admitting those aeriform bodies. This, so far as we can discover, was their theory;—The souls of believers, at death, departed into perfect happiness, and received their full reward: the soul needed no body to make it happy: matter would only impede its happiness and glory. Hence there was no resurrection of the dead. This was the "*ancient heresy*" which distracted the early Christian church; to which Mr. Sherwood has alluded; and which, through inexcusable ignorance of church history, he has actually charged upon us as our doctrine! (Disc. p. 7.)

To counteract this ancient and dangerous error, one class of the early fathers who entered the lists against "the platonizing Christians," maintained that the souls of believers after death remained in a state of insensibility, and deep slumber, until they received their bodies back again from the grave. For they fell directly into the opposite extreme. They taught that the soul could not enjoy happiness and glory **WITHOUT THE BODY!**

Another class of these opponents flattered themselves that they could more effectually resist these Platonic errorists, by assuming a middle position. They did not go quite so far as the other opponents. They held that the departed souls did indeed retain the power of acting, and of knowing, and delighting in God. But, still, until the re-union of the soul to the body, they were not perfect in any thing. They did indeed allow them some sensations, some capacity of enjoyment: but they were not received into heaven: they were retained in a **PLACE** apart from heaven, and they did not allow

* De Civit. Dei. Lib. 13. Cap. 16.

them to enter heaven till they received their bodies back again from the grave.

There is nothing new under the sun, not even in the wild vagaries of theologians. The *first* of these sects was revived in the persons of certain speculators at the time of the Reformation; whom the pious divines who drew up the earliest Scottish Confession of Faith, in A. D. 1560, did impressively call "certain fantastics" (fanatics), "who affirm that the departed souls do sleep, and come to a certain oblivion." At a later period this theory was revived by Parker in his book "*De Descensu*," Lib. ii. p. 77.—The venerable John Howe has, in a brief manner, shown up this theory, as contrary to reason, philosophy, and Scripture.*

At a still later period, this theory was revived by Dr. Law, late bishop of Carlisle. He has been refuted by Dr. Campbell.†

On the other hand, the theory of the *second* class of these sects, has also been revived by several writers of the high church party in England and in our country. They profess to believe in "an intermediate PLACE." "It is not heaven:" "it is apart from heaven:" "it is not the kingdom of glory:" "it is in the lower parts of the earth:" "it is the prison of soul, *into which Christ descended and preached to the spirits there:*" it is the bosom of Abraham, and paradise"—"apart from the mansions of glory."‡

In opposition to these various theories, the doctrine of the purest of the early fathers, and that which is expressed in the confessions, canons, and articles of the different sections of the Reformed Churches, is this:—First, The souls of believers are at their death, made perfect in holiness. Second, They are judged at death, and admitted immediately into glory in heaven or paradise, where Christ is, there to enjoy true and eternal glory. This is THE INTERMEDIATE STATE of departed souls. There is, we believe, no INTERMEDIATE PLACE. And at the last day, the souls of believers having again received their bodies raised out of the grave, do after the general judgment, receive their complete reward in PERFECT glory and PERFECT happiness.

We are now prepared, I. To review the arguments advanced by the high church party in defence of their theory.

* Howe's Works, Haven's N. York Edit. p. 222. Note R.

† Dissert. VI. Part ii. Sect. 23.

‡ Seabury's Sermons; Hobart, &c. &c.

II. We shall review the evidence by which the doctrine of the holy Bible on this point is fully sustained.

I. The doctrine of AN INTERMEDIATE PLACE.—In the *first* place, the advocates have eulogized this doctrine as “most reasonable and scriptural,” and as “*most comfortable, and glorious doctrine.*” We shall see presently whether it has any claims to be “reasonable and scriptural.” For its attributes of “comfort and glory,” it seems to us rather surprising that they should have been claimed for it. “Comfortable and glorious” to depart *not* perfect in holiness; and, therefore, with sin and corruption lingering in them! “Comfortable and glorious” to be excluded from heaven for untold ages! “Comfortable and glorious” not to be in glory with Christ until the last day! “Comfortable and glorious” to be in a place “away from heaven.” and “in the lowest parts of the earth!” “Comfortable and glorious” to be away from Christ’s presence, exiled from heaven, and shut up in the prison of Spirits until the last day!—Surely the reason of the humblest Sabbath School pupil would promptly pronounce it unspeakably more “comfortable and glorious” to be made perfect in holiness at death, and to enter immediately into true happiness and eternal glory, with Christ in heaven!

Second. The advocates of this doctrine involve themselves in ambiguity and confusion at every step. They profess to advocate the doctrine of “an intermediate PLACE.” Their proofs go to show merely the truth of an “intermediate STATE.” This error pervades their every argument. They lose sight, some how or other, of our doctrine entirely: namely, that the souls of believers at death, enter in a perfect state of holiness, into a *high* degree of happiness, and eternal glory, in heaven. And at the last day they reach the utmost perfection of felicity, and glory everlasting. They labour to represent us as teaching that the saints at death are completely perfect not only in *holiness*, but also in *happiness and glory!* And having by this manoeuvre, contrived to identify us with the platonizing fathers, they charge us with the guilt of adhering to an “ancient heresy.” (Sherwood, p. 7.)

Having thus put themselves in a wrong position, they have fallen and floundered into an argument befitting this false position. Their argument substantially is this, as we have already hinted:—At the *general* judgment, the saints are made perfect in holiness and happiness and glory: hence there is no *particular* judgment at death: hence souls are not in heaven, and will not be there, until they receive their bodies

from the grave, and enter on full perfection in glory after the last day. Every text which they quote, say they, goes to establish these positions: namely, that we are not made *perfect* in happiness and glory until the last day. Hence there is an intermediate STATE: and because there is such a state, therefore we have proved that there is an intermediate PLACE. For such is their inference! The evidence of an intermediate *state*, establishes an intermediate PLACE! And because no soul is perfectly happy until the last day: therefore no one has happiness in heaven in any degree whatever! Therefore no souls are in heaven: therefore they are somewhere else, and that is paradise, or the intermediate place! Such is the logic of the high church party on this point.

By this mode of reasoning, they might, with equal success, prove that because there is a *general* providence, there can be no *particular* providence! And because the son and heir of a kingdom does not reach the full honours, and the complete enjoyment of his estate, until he is fully of age; therefore, he is not admitted to his father's table, nor even allowed to appear in his father's house, during the "intermediate state" of his non-age!

Third. By way of *argumentum ad invidiam*, our opponents charge it to the guilt of our doctrine that it is, primarily, popish. Mr. Sherwood, following in the steps of his masters, even ventures to tell the public that the Church of Rome was the *first* to declare this doctrine authoritatively, that the souls of believers enter immediately into glory. (pp. 56, 57.) It will be enough, in order to set him, right simply to quote the Romish doctrine, as established by the council of Florence. "Tria esse loca, &c. There are three places of the departed souls: those of the saints are in heaven: those of the wicked are in hell: those who died under *venial* sins, are in purgatory."* Now, as the latest high church writer on this point, maintains that the souls of believers depart *not* perfect in holiness, and of course with sin and depravity still adhering to them, he must mean the sin adhering to the believer,—not the *mortal* sin of the impenitent. He must mean then, *venial* sins. And if they thus depart in sin, this sin must either be expurgated in the other world; or, as the necessary result,—it must "wax worse and worse." Here, then, we have our author putting souls, with their sins,

* Labbeus, Concil. Tom. XVIII. p. 26. Also Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 452, London new edition.

“into a prison,” in “the lower parts of the earth!” If this be not purgatory, nothing has ever yet existed so precisely like it! And that things so very similar will approximate, by the law of their nature, until they shall become completely one, we have the following evidence in an extract from the Oxford Tracts, by Dr. Pusey. It will be seen that the only difference between our high churchmen, and the Oxford divines, and the Dublin Doctor Todd, is simply this,—the latter have got considerably the start of the former. They have been both on the same descent; and are both in full career of descent to find their level. Let us hear Dr. Pusey:—“Prayer for departed saints—since knowing them to be in a state” (place?) “of imperfect bliss, until the resurrection, whenever we pray for the final coming of God’s kingdom, we do, in fact (if we have any thought for the departed), *pray at the same time, for the perfecting of their bliss!*”^{*} Hence there is scarcely even a degree of visibility between this high church doctrine, and the more ancient fiction of purgatory!

Fourth. They appeal to the primitive Christian fathers in favour of their novel doctrine. Now, no sober and discreet man, who is even very partially acquainted with these fathers, would venture such an appeal. I shall select a few specimens of the opinions of the best of them. St. Augustine says,—“We own a heaven and a hell; besides these we know of no middle place. *Tertium locum penitus ignoramus, &c.*† Ephraim teaches,—“that to escape hell, is to enter into the kingdom of heaven: to fail of heaven is to be plunged into hell.”‡ Ignatius, in his epistle to the Magnesians, speaks of “future happiness and misery:”—“a state of life, and a state of death,” without the slightest allusion to a “middle place.” Polycarp wrote on the resurrection; and Athenagoras, the Athenian philosopher, composed a treatise on the same subject. Yet neither of them allude either to a purgatory or a middle place.§ Cyril, of Alexandria, in the Homily *De Exitu Animi*, thus writes:—“Οἱ δίκαιοι εἰς παράδεισον κ. τ. λ. The righteous depart to paradise; the impenitent into unquenchable fire: the righteous into heaven; the wicked into hell: the righteous into the hand of God; the wicked into the hands of the devil.”|| And, finally, the

* Dr. Pusey’s Answer in Defence of Tracts 75 and 78.

† Tom. X. p. 40.

‡ Opera, pp. 19, 20.

§ See Edgar’s Variations, p. 469.

|| Cyril. Alex. Opera, Tom. V. Pars 2. p. 410. Bern. De Moor IV. p. 153.

other fathers who taught a "middle place," did all of them teach that that place was a place of purgation from sins. This opinion was introduced by them from pagan writers. And in course of time it originated the monstrous fiction of purgatory. Even the best of these fathers, such as St. Augustine and Ambrose, prayed for *the dead who were in heaven!* Thus the first of these prayed for the soul of his mother Monica, who, being an eminent Christian, was undoubtedly in heaven.* Nay, what seems almost incredible, such fathers as Cyril, Chrysostom, Augustine, did not only pray for the saints in heaven, they even prayed for the doomed in hell. To use the words of Augustine,—“*Ut tolerabilior, &c. that their torments might come to an end.*”† So monstrously have these fathers’ works been corrupted; or, so monstrously corrupted were their own doctrinal opinions!

Fifth. The advocates of this novel doctrine of the intermediate PLACE appeal to certain texts of the Holy Scriptures. Their exposition of these texts we shall now review.

1st. They press in Heb. xi. 39, 40. These (Old Testament saints) all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us that they without us should not be perfect.” Here, say they, by “the promise” is meant heaven; hence the Old Testament saints have not yet received heaven! The error, here, lies in assuming, without proof, that by “promise” is meant heaven. But it will be quite obvious to those who critically examine the use of the word in the Sacred Scriptures, that it means that glorious promise—“THE PROMISE,” by way of eminence and superiority over all other promises; that which was given to our fallen and ruined race in the garden; namely, the promise of Messiah, who was to come in the flesh. This was THE PROMISE given to the fathers. On this promise all other blessings were suspended. To take it in any other sense, violates the apostle’s argument. His aim in this epistle is to convince the Hebrews that Jesus Christ is the Messiah promised to the fathers. Now he assumes that these saints are in heaven; and that it was by the faith of the coming of the Messiah that they were in glory. This is the *first* fact which he establishes. The *second* is this:—the unspeakable superiority of the New Testament dispensation to that of the Old. All our fathers, said he, died without having re-

* See Aug. Confes. IX. cap. 13. p. 173. Ambros. Tom. V. pp. 114, 121.

† Aug. Oper. VII. pp. 238, 239.

ceived the fulfillment of the illustrious promise of the incarnate Messiah. They lived not to see him in the flesh. But, we have received the promise. We have seen and welcomed "God manifest in the flesh." They of old, have only the promise uttered to their faith. We have its fulfillment demonstrated before our eyes. And this new dispensation of grace is "that better thing" which we have. Their dispensation was one of types, figures, and shadows. Ours is that of the visible reality of the substance. They without us were not perfect. Theirs was the incipient dispensation. Ours is the consummated one.—This is the substance of the apostle's argument to convince and win over the Hebrews. What a repulsive argument would our opponents make out of this,—by making the apostle assure the Hebrews that not one of all their eminent patriarchs had yet reached heaven!

And even admitting their interpretation of "the promise," it can be referred only to the case of the Old Testament saints alone. For the apostle expressly names them, and limits his reference to them. Their conclusion then, were it even legitimate, cannot affect the certainty of the souls of New Testament believers entering immediately into heaven at death. So, then, even at the best, this lame and halting exposition, is nothing less nor more than the revival of the old popish doctrine of "THE LIMBUS OF THE FATHERS." That is to say, the imprisonment of the Old Testament saints in "the prison" of Limbus, until Christ, as they suppose, went down and preached to the spirits in prison, and brought them all up with him when he went, in his soul, to paradise!

But there is another strong point which fully establishes our exposition of this passage. It is this. To refer "the promise" to the soul's enjoyment of heaven; and, thence, to infer that the souls of the Old Testament saints, and also all other saints since their time, in their "not obtaining the promise," did not enter into heaven at death,—does actually place the apostle in direct contradiction to himself. In Hebrews vi. 12, he explicitly declared that departed saints, through faith and patience, do inherit the promises. In verse 15, he declares the same thing of Abraham, who had "obtained the promise." And this was true in reference to the temporal blessings promised: the multiplication of his family; the certainty of the descent of the Messiah from him; and, lastly, the grand end, and all absorbing aim of his faith in that Messiah, his introduction into the kingdom of heaven at death.

And, if possible, to make assurance doubly sure, the apostle rehearses the condition of departed saints as "the spirits of just men made perfect," with whom the church on earth is brought into a joyful and glorious communion. Heb. xii. 23.

2d. They press in John iii. 13, to prop their theory: "*No man hath ascended up to heaven* but he that came down from heaven; even the son of man who is in heaven." This is entirely foreign from the point. It has not the remotest reference to the state of departed souls. It is a passage similar to that of Rom. x. 6, "Say not in thy heart, who shall ascend into heaven; that is, to bring Christ down?" So, our Lord, in the above text, says, "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" "And no man hath ascended into heaven,"—that is, no created being can ascend into heaven, in order to discover the infinite mind of God. No one can do this, but HE who came down from heaven; even the Son of Man who is in heaven." This text, therefore, is injured by their false exposition.

3d. They lay much stress on that divine sentence in John xiv. 2, 3, "In my Father's house are many mansions: I go to prepare a place for you;—and *I will come again* to receive you to myself: that where I am, there may ye be also."—Here, say they, it is manifest that no departed soul is in heaven, nor will be in heaven, until Christ *comes again* to receive them to himself. But Christ does not come again to receive them until the last day. Hence, no departed soul is in heaven now, nor will be, until after the general judgment.

This sophistry is founded on the assumption that there is only ONE "coming of Christ again." Now we humbly conceive that no one well acquainted with his Bible could have fallen into this error. There are certain "comings of Christ our Lord," which cannot be referred to the last day only. *First*:—God our sovereign "COMETH forth," when he inflicts severe judgments on men. See Isaiah lxiii. 1, and Micah i. 3. *Second*:—Our Lord COMES to a people, when he sends the gospel to them. Math. xvi. 28, "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." See also Ephes. ii. 15, 16. This coming of our Lord can by no rules of criticism be referred to his final coming at the last day.

Third:—Christ comes to each one of us, personally, at death. Math. xxiv. 44, and xxv. 12, “Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not of, the Son of Man cometh.” This cannot be referred to his coming at the last day. If so, then it is assumed that each one of us shall live on the earth until the Great God shall appear at the last judgment! *Fourth:*—There is a second coming of Christ, in his human nature, at the last day, as the Judge of all the quick and dead. “Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him.” Rev. i. 7.

This coming of Christ, alluded to in John xiv. 2, 3, has a double application. He comes at death to receive each of us *personally* into heaven. He comes at the last day to receive us *collectively*, as his CHURCH, into his mansions of glory. Their theory, therefore, derives no aid from this text.

4th. Another text on which they lay violent hands, is Acts ii. 34, “David is *not* yet ascended into the heavens.” Can any thing be plainer? David is not in heaven. And if such a saint be not in heaven, then, verily, no other saint is in heaven! Hence there is not a saint in heaven yet!! Therefore there is an intermediate PLACE.

This text, as is evident from the context, refers manifestly to the resurrection of the body, and not to the state, or place of David’s soul. The apostle is demonstrating to his audience the fact of Christ’s resurrection. To effect this, he quotes Psalm xvi. 10, 11, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,”—that is, in SHEOL, in Hades, in the invisible world: that is, in a state of separation from my body: “neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.” From this passage he reasons thus:—This account of the resurrection cannot be referred to David himself. For he is dead and buried; and his sepulchre is with us. He is, therefore, not received into the heavens, as this Holy One is here distinctly said to be. Hence, it is not of David’s dead body, that he speaks in this place; but of Messiah’s dead body. Hence our Lord said to Mary,—“Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my God, and your God.” His pure and holy soul had, indeed, been received by his Father, in heaven, in his “intermediate state;” but he had not yet ascended to heaven in his complete human nature. This took place at his ascent from Mount Olivet.

Such is the amount of their argument; and a specimen of their mode of conducting it. We shall now invite attention

to the arguments on behalf of THE INTERMEDIATE STATE, in opposition to this novel and ill-sustained fiction of AN INTERMEDIATE PLACE.

We beg attention to two distinct heads of discussion.—**FIRST:** That the souls of believers are, at their death, MADE PERFECT IN HOLINESS. **SECOND:** That the souls of believers do, at their death, PASS IMMEDIATELY INTO GLORY ETERNAL, AND A HIGH DEGREE OF HAPPINESS.

FIRST: THEY ARE MADE PERFECT IN HOLINESS AT DEATH.—This is the doctrine of the Church of Christ, professed by all the branches of the Reformed Church. The following quotations will show this. In the shorter catechism of the Westminster Assembly, which forms a part of the creed of all the branches of the Presbyterian Churches, at home and abroad, this doctrine is expressed:—"The souls of believers are, at their death, MADE PERFECT IN HOLINESS." Quest. 37. In the Heidelberg catechism, which is a part of the creed of the Reformed Dutch Church, it is thus taught:—"Our death is not a satisfaction for sin, but only AN ABOLISHING OF SIN." "After this life, I shall inherit perfect salvation. Quest. 42, 58. With the R. D. Church agree the Reformed churches of France, Switzerland, Holland, and the Reformed German Church in Germany, and in the United States, which adopt this as their catechism. In the Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church the same doctrine is taught, by implication, in the Communion Service, and directly in the following passage in the Burial of the Dead. "O Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord: and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." Thus, departed saints are delivered from the burden of that "flesh and blood" which cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. This is the sense in which the apostle Paul uses the word "FLESH," in describing the corruption of our nature.* If the advocates of the intermediate place insist that by "flesh," in this passage, is meant the "*flesh*" literally, that is, the body, how can they reconcile the whole of this passage with their own doctrine, that the soul is not admitted into heaven "to live with the Lord," until it be reunited to the flesh at the last day? The "flesh" here intended is that which must be "cast off" utter-

* Rom. viii. 1, 4, 5, 9, 13, &c.

ly in order to our "dwelling with God in joy and felicity." We must be "*delivered from it.*" Now, assuredly, this is not the language used to describe the departure of the soul from the body at death. It appropriately describes our escape from a loathsome enemy in us, which is extripated on our departure from the body. And we suspect strongly that this is the meaning of the passage in the opinion of all high churchmen; for they take special care not to quote *the whole* of this passage, in their arguments, offensive and defensive, on the novel doctrine of "the intermediate place."

Lastly: This is the doctrine of the holy Scriptures. "The righteous is taken away from the evil *to come*," &c. "Isaiah lvii. 1. Here are two points of evidence: 1st. They "enter into peace:" that is "the peace of God," after death. Hence all their sin must be taken away. For there is no peace after death where sin is. That is, the righteous depart in a state of perfect holiness. 2d. "They are taken away from the evil." Let it be remarked that the words "*to come*," are not in the Hebrew. They are "taken away from the evil:" that is, the evil of sin, and the evil of suffering. Can any other class of evil be intended?

In the glorious vision on the mount of Transfiguration, "Moses and Elias appeared in glory." Now our opponents teach that there is no perfection in holiness, in other words, no degree of eternal glory in heaven bestowed on saints until the day of final judgment. But here Elijah appears in his glorified body and soul. And here is Moses, not in his body, but in his glorified soul, appearing "in glory," as well as Elijah. Being in glory, they must of course be perfectly free of all sin.

The apostle in detailing the spiritual privileges of the saints of the New Testament times, enumerates, among other blessings, their close communion with heaven. "We are come to the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to God the judge of all, to THE SPIRITS OF JUST MEN MADE PERFECT," &c. Since then, the spirits of the just are made perfect by God, they must be entirely free from sin.

And, finally, John, in the visions of their glory, beheld the souls of the departed saints "clothed in white robes;" "washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb;"—"in their mouth was found *no guile*; for they are *without fault before the throne of God*" This was their condition in the days of John; and such, therefore, is their state previous to the last day. See Rev. vi. 9, 10. vii. 13—17. xiv. 2—5.

SECOND: The souls of believers enter immediately after their death, into heaven, or paradise, to enjoy eternal glory, and a high degree of happiness.

Here it would be easy to parade quotations from the ancient Greek and Latin fathers. But we have, by the specimen already given, made our escape from this necessity. Gravely speaking, we think we could undertake to prove any doctrine from the fathers; and then, from the same fathers, prove directly the reverse of it! This state of their writings seems to be produced by two causes. 1st. Their works have been corrupted by the monks of the dark ages; and many additions foisted into them.* 2d. These writings exhibit the gradual approach of those fathers from error to truth: and from truth again into error. They are a kind of a barometer, to mark the risings and depressions of their minds. They are a diary, in short, in which they enter their progress in opinions; their speculation, and faith, from their youth to intellectual manhood; from the manhood of the mind, to their dotage. We have a striking instance of this in the two huge folios of the father of the Friends, William Penn. In the beginning of his 1700 pages folio, he is at first nothing; he gradually seems somewhat *Calvinish*: then he is Arminian; anon, he is Pelagian; then Arian; then Sabellian. In the same manner on the pages of the glorious Luther. On his early pages he is a papist, and adores the Pope. Then, year after year, and through page after page, his giant mind forces its way by the word and spirit of God into the commanding position of a pure, whole-souled, disinterested Reformer. We shall, therefore, make no farther appeal to the fathers on this point. Although it would be no difficult matter to produce the best of them, in our favour.

The doctrine we advocate has ever been the doctrine of the church of God. We rejoice that we can carry off bishop Bull from the camp of the enemy's hosts.† Let us hear him. "I do affirm the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive church to be this:—that the souls of all the faithful, immediately after death, enter into a place and state of bliss, far exceeding all the felicities of this world; though short of that most consummate, perfect beatitude of heaven, with which they are to be crowned and rewarded in the resurrection.

* See Erasmus' preface to his splendid edition of St. Augustine's works, dedicated to a Spanish Prelate.

† Unless like the Greek and Latin Fathers, he wants the unanimous consent with his own self, in his own writings.

And so, on the contrary, that the souls of all the wicked are, presently after death, in a state of very great misery; and yet dreading a far greater misery at the day of judgment.”*

In consistency with this enlightened declaration, the Presbyterian Churches of the United States, Canada, Great Britain and Ireland, who adhere to the Westminster confession and catechisms, profess this doctrine, which Bishop Bull pronounces to have been “the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive church.” A single extract will be sufficient. “The souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory.” Catechism, Quest. 37.

The Reformed Dutch Church in the United States and in Holland; the Reformed Churches of France, Switzerland, Germany, and in the United States, do utter their voice strongly and decisively on this point. “After this life, we reign with Christ eternally over all creatures.” “Death is an abolishing of sin, and A PASSAGE INTO ETERNAL LIFE.” “My soul, after this life, shall be IMMEDIATELY taken up to Christ its head.” “After this life, I shall inherit perfect salvation.” *Heidel. Catechism, Quest. 32, 42, 57, 58.*† The doctrine which follows this statement, is in precise accordance with the statement of the learned Dr. Bull; namely,—At the resurrection of the body, we shall enter upon our perfect happiness and eternal glory in our souls and bodies, in the church triumphant.

The Protestant Episcopal Church also utters her voice we think very distinctly against the opinion of the high church party in her. We shall select the following from the beautiful and solemn service of the Dead:—“I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, write, from henceforth blessed are the dead, &c.” This quotation seems to be taken out of the old version of the scriptures, in use before our present translation was made.‡ And the position of the word “henceforth,” as it stands in this clause of the Burial of the Dead, makes it, if possible, even stronger in our favour. “Write, blessed from henceforth are the dead.” That is, if there be any meaning in plain language, the departed souls of the

* Bp. Bull’s Sermon on THE MIDDLE STATE.

† Yet Mr. Sherwood quotes the standards of the Dutch Church as one with his fiction of an Intermediate Place! *Disc. pp. 51, 54.*

‡ In the present version it runs thus:—“Write, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from henceforth, &c.”

saints are in heaven's blessedness from the very instant of their decease. We shall give another extract even stronger, if possible, than this, in order to do justice to the genuine doctrine of the Episcopal Church, in opposition to the innovations of the high church party within her. We allude to the prayer in the same service:—"Almighty God, with whom do **LIVE** the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord; and **WITH WHOM** the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity, &c." The prayer closes with the hope "of the perfect consummation and bliss, in body and soul," at the last day. The Episcopal Church is, therefore, decisively and perfectly at one on this point with all her sister churches. There is another sentence in the closing prayer to the same effect: and we quote it in order to point out an instance of unfair dealing in a late sermon writer on this subject. It is this:—"We humbly beseech thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, that when we shall depart this life, we may rest in him, **AND** that at the general resurrection, &c." Hence, the consummation of the last day is exhibited as coming in due time, after the soul shall have been long in heaven. But Mr. Sherwood, p. 14, puts the word "*but*" instead of "*and*" in order very probably to help the sentence to utter a tone in favour of his theory.

We shall now notice the sentiments of conspicuous modern divines in order to vindicate them from the imputation thrown on them by our opponents, that they believed in the *Intermediate Place*. And we shall accept of the quotations of these theologians as given by Hobart, Sherwood, &c. and thank them for helping our cause. Parkhurst says,*—"Paradise is, in the New Testament, applied to the **STATE** of faithful souls between death and the resurrection—where they are admitted to immediate communion with God in Christ, &c." Doddridge is not quite decisive on either side. Yet we accept of this quotation,—"**Thou shall be with me in paradise, the abode of happy saints when separate from the body.**" Dr. Watts also makes paradise a **STATE**, not a *place*, in which saints are happy.† Dr. Adam Clark, on 2 Cor. xii. 7, calls it "*the place of the blessed, or the state of departed spirits.*"

Dr. Dwight held the doctrine which we advocate. Yet Mr. Sherwood ventures to press him into his service, in the fol-

* Greek Lexicon, vox. Parad.

† Ess. on Separ. State, Sect. 3.

lowing form of quotation. "There can, I apprehend, be no reasonable doubt concerning an intermediate STATE." Now, in the first instance, this is nothing to *his* purpose. For Mr. S. advocates an intermediate *place*. In the next instance, it is a garbled and unfair quotation given by Mr. S. The whole sentence,—“Whatever may be true concerning an intermediate *place*, there can, I apprehend, be no reasonable doubt concerning an intermediate STATE.”* This is precisely our doctrine.

Dr. Campbell is also pressed in by the high church opposition. But he is on our side *so far as he is consistent with himself*. Here are his words:—“There is in a lower degree, a reward of the righteous, and a punishment of the wicked, in a STATE,”—he does not say a place,—“in a STATE intervening between death and the resurrection.” Again:—“The apostle Paul speaks of the souls as admitted to enjoyment, *in the presence of God, immediately after their death*.”†

The leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way are manifestly with us. For instance, Dean Stanhope says,—“The soul lives in a separate STATE from the body, and such a STATE as is susceptible of happiness or misery.”

Dr. Wheatly says,—“The interval between death, and the end of the world, is a STATE”—not *place*—“A STATE of expectation and imperfect bliss.” Then he adds that the completion and perfection of their happiness take place at the last day.‡ Archbishop Secker thus writes:—“Hades means the invisible world, one part or other of which, the souls of the deceased, whether good or bad, inhabit.” And he adds, that the saints are there, “waiting for a still more perfect happiness at the last day.”§ Bishop Newton says,—“The separate souls are happy or miserable: but not so miserable nor happy as they shall be at the resurrection.”|| Bishop Mant, as quoted by Mr. Sherwood, is decidedly of orthodox belief. “The intermediate STATE,”—he does not say *place*,—“is one of rest and repose.” He adds that this will be succeeded by another state of perfect happiness at the last day.¶

* Sermon, 164, Vol. iv. p. 423, New Haven edit. of 1823.—

† Vol. i. Diss. vi. Part ii. Sect. 19, 22.

‡ On the Com. Prayer, p. 304, Boston edition of 1825.

§ Secker on the Catechism, Lect. 9.

|| On the Intermediate State, vol. iii. pp. 559, 661, Lond. edit.

¶ Happiness of the Blessed, p. 10.

In a word, the ancient and sound fathers of this venerable section of the Reformed Church, do, to a man, believe as do their compeers of other Churches. But the party of the high churchmen within her, and those approximating to Romanism, do, to a man, advocate this *quasi* purgatory of an intermediate place of souls, *not* perfect in holiness.

We now proceed to examine the evidence of our doctrine derived from the Holy Scriptures.

The king of Israel declares that "the dust shall return to the earth, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." This, as will be more fully explained by the texts to be quoted, determines that the soul of the righteous at death is with God who is in heaven.

The prophet Isaiah assures the mourner that the righteous do, at death, enter into peace. That cannot mean the grave, for the wicked also enter the grave. It is the peace of God in heaven. "They rest on their beds." Their bodies sleep in the grave. "Each one walking in his uprightness." This indicates life, activity, and happiness. Let this be explained by the following texts; for the system of divine truth is unique and one.

On the mount of Transfiguration, Moses and Elias appeared in glory with Christ. They both appeared in glory. Moses therefore, as a pure spirit, was where Elias, in body and soul, was. But, we have the testimony of the Holy Spirit, that Elias "was taken up into heaven." 2 Kings ii. 1 and 11. Therefore, Moses was in heaven, and in no intermediate PLACE, "apart from heaven," and "out of heaven."

Our Lord, in refuting the Saducees, said, "The Lord is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob : he is not the God of the dead, but of the living : for all *live unto him*." Luke xx. 37, 38. Set down with this the words of Paul: "None of us liveth unto himself ; and no man dieth unto himself : for, whether we live, we live unto the Lord ; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord ; living, or dying, therefore, we are the Lord's." Rom. xiv. 8, 9. Hence the patriarchs, and all who lived to the Lord, have died to him. He is their God after death, as well as in life. They are with him ; for "they live to him." This implies presence with him, and happiness, and glory, as the necessary consequence.

When Stephen was dying, "he saw Christ standing on the right hand of God," and he said, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." This was spoken by one who was full of the Holy Ghost. It was therefore the prayer of one guided by

the Holy Ghost. Hence it was heard : and hence his soul was received by Christ, and was where he is. Therefore the soul of Stephen is in heaven, where Christ is.

The whole family of God, *named after Christ*, is in heaven, and on earth. Eph. iii. 15. This family is that which is named after Christ. Hence it includes all Christians only. But, they are “in heaven, or on earth.” The departed are, of course, *in heaven*, as certainly as those who are *not* departed, are *on earth*. There is of course no middle place. It is unknown on the pages of the Holy Bible. They are all either in heaven, or on earth. Hence every member of Christ’s family, when they leave the Church below, are received into the family of God above, in the heaven of heavens.

“Them that sleep in Jesus, God will bring with him.” 2 Thess. iv. 14. In connection with this passage, take Jude, ver. 14. “Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment on all.” Nothing can be more evident than this, that when Christ comes to judgment, he will summon his *saints* as well as his angels, to attend him downward to the services of the last judgment. But in as much as he brings the *SAINTS* with him when he comes, it is quite evident they were *with him* previous to his descent to judgment. How could he bring them *with him*, if they had not previously been *with him*? Hence, departed souls are now with him, in heaven. And when he returns to his glory with all his triumphing saints, now invested with their bodies raised from the dead, “he will bring them with him,” in the fulness of perfection in happiness and glory, to his everlasting habitations.

Our exalted Redeemer, in his intercessory prayer, John xvii. 24, says,—“Father, I will that those whom thou hast given me, be *WITH ME WHERE I AM*,” &c. Let this divine expression be explained in connection with *two* facts. 1st. That Christ ceases to plead for those who are dead. 2d. That, as we have already shown, he comes at death to each one of his people, to receive their souls to himself. Therefore, when the saints die, according to the will of God, and according to the intercession of Christ, they do go to Christ, to be *WITH HIM*, and where he is. But our Saviour is in heaven, in his glory. Therefore departed souls of believers do go into heaven, and its eternal glory. There is no way of evading this conclusion, but by making out one or other of two things. 1st. That Christ does *not* come to each one of

his ransomed children at death. But we have already shown, out of Math. xxiv. 44, and xxv. 13, that he does certainly so come in his infallible love of righteousness. Or, 2d. That our Lord's intercessory prayer is *not* heard, nor answered by the Father, even when, as his equal, he says,—“Father, I WILL!” But no one of these truths and facts can be questioned for a moment. Therefore, the souls of departed Christians are with Christ in the glory and happiness of heaven.

The apostle assures us, by divine inspiration, that “when the house of this tabernacle,” the body, “is dissolved” in death, “we have,”—he does not say *shall have*,—but “we *have* a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” Can any thing be more explicit? When the body is dissolved, the soul departs,—whither? “Into a house not made with hands, eternal, IN THE HEAVENS, where our Saviour is. The following adds the force of demonstration to this. “While we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord,” ver. 6, 8. To these, let me add the following:—“To me to live is Christ: to die is gain. To depart, and to be with Christ is far better,” Phil. i. 22, 23. Here the evidence is complete. To be absent from the body “by death,” is to be present with the Lord. When, therefore, we leave the body, we are present with Christ. But, he is in heaven in his glory. When, therefore, we leave the body, we are in heaven in glory and felicity with him.

Had Paul believed in the “intermediate place,” and had he been assured that his soul at death went into “a prison,” into “a place apart from heaven,” “a place away from heaven,”—most assuredly he never would have poured out his holy soul in this ardent desire. “To depart and to be with Christ, is far better!” We have, therefore, the whole weight of St. Paul's experience and divine inspiration against an “Intermediate Place.”

The apostle John was permitted, in the visions of glory, to have a glimpse of the Intermediate State in heaven. The souls of the martyrs he beheld in their glory. He saw them “under the altar;”—that is,—stripping the language of what is figurative,—he saw them at the feet of our Divine Redeemer, who makes intercession “at the golden altar;” even in the heaven of heavens. He “saw white robes given unto them.” And they are before the throne of God; and serve

him day and night, in the glories and felicity of the beatific vision. Revel. vi. 9, 10. vii. 13, 17.

Now, if there be an Intermediate Place, "apart from heaven,"—then is our Jesus Christ in his glorified nature in that Intermediate Place; and in a "place out of heaven." If there be an Intermediate Place, then is the throne of God there, in "a place apart from heaven," and "out of heaven." But these saints are at the feet of Christ; they are where he is: they are where the throne of God, and the Lamb, is. Hence, they are in a state, and place of perfect holiness, and in the glory and felicity of heaven, and in no Intermediate Place, "apart from heaven," and "away from heaven."

We may be allowed to advert again to the consolatory message of our Lord to John in Revel. xvi. 13. "I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write; Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours: and their works do follow them." This testimony is decisive. "The dead who die in the Lord, are blessed." "They are blessed from henceforth;" even from the moment of their departure, "they are blessed;" they are blessed from the instant that they are "the dead." Their death, and their blessedness in glory in the Lord, are instantaneous. Their blessedness, or glory, lingers not until the last judgment. It has already commenced. And it commenced at their death. Hence, from the hour of their death, the souls of believers are with the Lord in heaven.*

We shall conclude with an examination of two Biblical expressions. The first is "*the bosom of Abraham.*" The souls of departed saints are, as well as that of Lazarus, in "the bosom of Abraham." See Math. viii. 11, 12. This is an exhibition of the joys of heavenly communion and glory, under the familiar figure of an intellectual feast and joyful flow of soul. As the beloved disciple reclined on the bosom of Jesus, at the communion of the first supper: so each of the departed saints in heaven reclines on the bosom of Abraham in glory. That is, they are admitted where that father of the faithful is; they enjoy the intimacy, the communion, and the fellowship, and the happiness, and the glory of heaven, in common with Abraham. We cannot con-

* Schleusner, on the word *ἄρτι*, observes that when it is construed with the preposition *αὐτοῦ*, as in this text under review, it denotes the present time, even this very instant. "They are blessed from the very instant of their death."

ceive any other meaning that can be attached to this expression. But Abraham, with the other patriarchs, is in no other place than the third heavens, or where "the Lord is, in his kingdom above." "Many shall come," said our Lord, in Math. viii. 11, 12,—“from the east, and from the west; and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.” Now, these patriarchs are dead, and buried. They do not belong to the Lord’s “kingdom of heaven upon the earth.” Hence they are in “the kingdom of heaven above; where the Lord Jesus Christ is; and where “the dead all live to the Lord.” Luke xx. 38. Rom. xiv. 8. This receives additional strength from the contrast in the following verse. To be out of “this state and place of Abraham,” is to be “with the rebellious children of the kingdom, who are cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.” As certainly, therefore, as the latter are in the punishment of Gehenna, that is, hell; so certainly are the former in the glory of heaven.*

It now only remains, in the second place, to decide the import and location of PARADISE. The advocates of the intermediate place take very great pains to show that paradise is NOT heaven: but a “place out of it,” and “apart from it.”

There happens to be only one passage on which they expend their criticism to sustain that opinion. This passage is 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4. “I knew a man in Christ, about fourteen years ago, whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth: such an one was caught up into the third heaven. And I knew such a man, whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth: how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.”

Here, say they, are two distinct visions. The apostle is first wrapt up into the third heaven: then, afterwards, in another vision, he is caught up into paradise. Hence they are TWO DISTINCT PLACES; and heaven is *not* paradise.

On this loose and inconclusive logic we beg leave to remark:—1st. That even were we to admit the supposition of two distinct visions, and raptures, it does by no means logically follow that there are two *distinct places* into which the apostle was taken up. All that can be logically inferred is simply this,—that Paul was caught up *twice*, into a place of

* See Bernard De Moor’s dissertation on this, in Tom. vi. p. 607, of his *Perpet. Comment. in Markii Compendium*.

glory: that in speaking of the first rapture, he called it the third heaven; and in speaking of the second rapture, he called it paradise. The admission of two visions, therefore, will not prove that he was in two different places. This must be obvious to every scholar.

2d. Admitting farther, for the sake of argument, that these were *two* distinct places, it would clearly follow from the words of the apostle, that if there be any difference at all between these two places, paradise must be the principal, and most glorious place in the third heaven. For he speaks of nothing he had seen, and of nothing that he had heard, in the third heaven. It was paradise, that was the grand theatre of display in this sublime exhibition. It was in paradise that he heard unspeakable words, even words "not lawful to be uttered." Now, while this can be explained on our assumption, that heaven and paradise are the same place;—it is quite evident that those who make them two distinct places, must, by the most logical inferences, admit from these words of the apostle, that paradise is the chiefest place in the third heavens!

But, 3d. We can see no decisive evidence in the sacred narrative, that the apostle had two distinct visions: or that he makes heaven and paradise two distinct places. He sets down only one date,—namely fourteen years ago. When he mentions his rapture into the third heavens, he details nothing of aught he had seen or heard. He then repeats the wonderful statement, in order to give it a solemn and impressive emphasis; as if he had said:—"Yes, when speaking on the subject of revelations, and visions, I say, that I knew a man, fourteen years ago, caught up into the third heaven; which I also call paradise, into which I say, that man was caught up; and I call it distinctly by this name of paradise, in order to guard Christians against the whimsical fiction of the Jews, who, without any divine warrant, make paradise to be a place distinct from heaven. Now, in this third heaven, which is also called paradise, I heard unspeakable words—words not lawful to be uttered."

4th. Our Lord assured the dying penitent that "he should to day," that is, forthwith, "be with him in paradise." Now, while dying, our Lord cried with a loud voice,—“Father into thy hands I commend my spirit!” To be in “the hands of God,” is unquestionably the same thing as to be WITH HIM where he is, in the heaven of glory. And, assuredly, if “the spirits of just men made perfect” “return to God,” and are

with him, according to the testimony of divine revelation; beyond doubt the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, in answer to this parting prayer, went to God in heaven. For he uttered this prayer as one who had fully completed the work given him to accomplish; and who was, thence, to go to the Father, to be with him, henceforth. Hence, in his intercessory prayer in John ch. xvii. he said:—"And, now, I am no more in the world—AND I COME TO THEE." The departed soul of our Lord was, therefore, beyond all controversy, with his Father in the heaven of heavens, while his body was in the grave. By paradise, therefore, he meant heaven, whither he went at death; and into which he conducted the soul of the penitent on the cross. And the expression which the Lord of life, and of all the worlds, visible and invisible, uttered, is very remarkable. He did NOT say,—“I will be with thee;”—But, “THOU SHALT BE WITH ME IN PARADISE!” That is to say, —thou shalt be where I am. But our Lord was in heaven. Wherefore the penitent’s soul, which was in paradise, was in the heaven of heavens.

Lastly:—In Revel. xxii. 2, we have an impressive and heart-stirring description of heaven. No one will venture to deny that this passage reveals the reality, and particularities of the heaven of heavens. It follows consecutively, on the sublime and awful description of the general judgment, and can be referred to no other thing whatever.

Now, in this exhibition of heaven, THE TREE OF LIFE is set forth before us as occupying the midst of heaven. “It is in the midst thereof.” But there is only ONE Tree of Life. And that is the Lord Jesus Christ, the only source of our spiritual and eternal life; the only “way, and truth, and the life.”

Turn we, now, to Revel. ii. 7, and we find these words;—“To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of THE TREE OF LIFE, which is in THE MIDST OF THE PARADISE OF GOD!” This, the one, only Tree of Life, is in the midst of heaven; and in the midst of the paradise of God. Therefore HEAVEN IS PARADISE: and PARADISE IS HEAVEN. And, hence, there is no *Intermediate place* of departed souls, except what exists in the field of fiction and romance.

ART. II.—*Ancient Fragments of the Phœnician, Chaldean, Egyptian, Tyrian, Carthaginian, Indian, Persian, and other writers; with an Introductory Dissertation: and an Inquiry into the Philosophy and Trinity of the Ancients.* By Isaac Preston Cory, Esq., Fellow of Caius Coll. Cambridge. Second Edition. London: William Pickering. 1832. pp. 361.

OF the history of the earlier ages of the human race our knowledge is very defective. In relation to the period before the flood not a single document worthy of confidence exists, except those contained in the Hebrew scriptures. But the Bible makes no other historical pretensions than as respects the line of which the Saviour was to be born, and the records of the Jews as the people among whom it existed. Any other historical information it gives is only accidental. Nevertheless we find little else to rely upon concerning the history of the world during not only the age anterior to the flood, but also during more than one half of the period which has elapsed since that epoch. A cloud rests upon the beginning of our race—a cloud of fiction as well as of ignorance. Here, as in other subjects, we find ourselves bounded by the *inscrutable*, but more immediately by what we may call the *indefinite*, in which some things partially discovered lead out imagination, in the absence of realities, to construct a fabric of her own. And as, in most cases, where other minds have preceded, so here we are not made to feel, immediately upon reaching it, the limit of accurate knowledge, but become gradually sensible of it as the mists of theory and fiction part asunder and vanish away before stern inquiry. And it is no slight matter to resist the tendency to theorize upon the facts with which we may be furnished, and where these are defective, to supply the hiatus from fancied analogy. Truth we so much love, that where she is herself unattainable, we will worship even the image we have so conjured up to represent her. Fiction is pleasing only as the resemblance of truth, and theory is attractive only until discoveries are made to disprove; but the natural love for system and for completeness lead to it whenever knowledge is defective. As the imagination cannot be said to create otherwise than by re-producing, modifying, and combining into new connexions, the materials collected in various times and circumstances, and by lending its own character of spirituality to all. It therefore

can call up nothing radically new, but must carry out from the known all the materials of that with which it would people the unknown. In every tradition, however wild its character, it is our opinion there lie hid some seeds of truth. The tales of chimeras, of centaurs, &c. are most probably relations of real occurrences distorted by the multitude of hands through which they have come, and the arabesques with which imagination, playing with the vague and wonderful, has chosen to adorn them. Indeed the perfection of knowledge alone could prevent such from being the fate of all that is committed to the memory of man. For as darkness will magnify fear, not only by the addition of those terrors arising from obscurity and doubt, but also by affording place for the imagination to people with creatures of its own, so ignorance will often exalt to the supernatural, and invest with astonishing attributes what the light of knowledge would strip of all its wonder, by making it perfectly understood. Tradition generally long retains the more prominent features of the original story, but never without many modifications in the minor details;—and when no written records are preserved, many important transactions must come, in the course of time, to be forgotten altogether, from the crowding in of other things of later occurrence and more engrossing interest. Thus is excluded from the pale of authentic history, a large number of the earlier generations of mankind; as it could not be until after considerable advances had been made in civilization and the arts, that any other method of preserving the records of the past than oral tradition could be invented. The earliest fragment of a historical form, dates not farther back than the fourteenth century, B. C.; and even of that there is considerable doubt. This, however, is not altogether owing to the want of writing, but very much also to the fragile nature of the writing materials, and the limited number of copies which could possibly be published in those early ages, when the process of transcribing was so laborious, and readers so few. Frequent allusions are made by the oldest authors extant to others who had written before them. And strange indeed does it appear to us, who possess so many means of perserving literature, that all those works which we are told of as existing before the time of Homer, should have so completely gone the way of those transactions whose memory they vainly endeavoured to perpetuate, that scarcely one genuine fragment now remains. Thus has oblivion passed upon more than one half of the period of the existence of our

race, broken only in one direction by the writings of Moses. And even after this period, what is recorded, is but the annals of a small portion of the world, and that so mixed up with fable, as to make it difficult to know what to believe, and what to reject. Nor is it until the five hundredth year, B. C. that we meet with more than a distracted fragment of credible history.* Knowing, therefore, so little of the early history of mankind, there is interest in every hint which adds, in the slightest degree, to our ideas on the subject. And the task performed in the volume which has suggested these remarks, although adding nothing to what we knew before, is one which lays us under considerable obligations, inasmuch as it brings together, into something like connection, the fragments of the literature of those olden times which lie scattered among various writers of a late date. Many of the pieces, as they stand here, it must be acknowledged, do not seem to possess the same degree of importance as they do in the connexion in which they are found quoted; and some to the mere general reader must appear unmeaning from the same cause. But it must be no little lightening of labour to the student of theology and of ancient history, to have thus spread before his eye, and put at once into his hands, what he otherwise must have obtained, if obtained at all, by long and persevering investigation. From our previous remarks, we should expect to find those remains of the past much mingled with fable; as most of the writers relate not the transactions of their own times, but what had come down to them remarkable from previous ages: and those having been long committed wholly to tradition, had, undoubtedly, received many modifications from the imaginations of the various relators. The most of the historical fragments are accordingly either allegorical genealogies, or tales of wonder concerning beings who seemed to partake, at the same time, of the passions of men, and of the power of Gods. We have every reason to believe that many of these writers did their

* Herodotus did not write until about 430, B.C. The period of authentic history among the Chinese extends not farther back than the time of Confucius, who died, B. C. 477, and who must, therefore, have been nearly contemporary with Herodotus. The period of fable among the Hindoos comes down even later than the Christian aera. According to Klaproth, the authentic history of the Georgians commences in the third century, B. C.; of the Armenians in the second; of the Thibetians in the first century of the Christian aera; of the Persians in the third; of the Arabians in the fifth; of the Mongols in the twelfth; of the Turks in the fourteenth. Few European nations can state any thing with certainty of their ancestors before the time of Caesar.

best to arrive at the truth, but how was that truth to be obtained which lay behind some fifty or sixty generations, and obscured by the fiction which all these had combined to throw around it? Sanchoniatho, the earliest Gentile historian of whom we possess any remains, is indeed expressly stated to have been remarkably scrupulous with regard to the truth of what he related; but even with all his care, he seems to have been unable to gather the truth from the heaps of traditional rubbish with which it had become confounded. Yet he certainly had access to the most trust-worthy authorities which the Gentile world could afford. He was a Phœnician, and is generally supposed to have lived somewhere about the thirteenth or fourteenth century, B. C. A native of Tyre, some say Berytus, and the chief priest of his nation, thus possessing the most authentic sources of information. He is said to have written several works, both historical and theological, in the Phœnician language, of which none are now extant. Whatever we have of his, we owe to those Greek writers who have quoted from him, and to Philo Biblius, who, in the second century, A. D., translated his Phœnician history into Greek, from which again only a few fragments have been preserved to the present time in the quotations of Eusebius. These are concerning the history and theology of Phœnicia, and are evidently possessed of much of that spirit which we have stated as characterizing all early historical compositions. Here, however, it is proper to remark that as we are not certain that we have his own words, so we cannot be confident that his statements have not been perverted. For not only is the original language of the author irretrievably lost, and the remains transmitted to us through several hands, but in addition to all this they are mingled with the remarks of the author by whom they are quoted so much and so inseparably, that it is often difficult to tell what is ancient and what belongs to the transcriber. And even sometimes it is not very clear that the expressions are those of the ancient writer at all, but rather a general statement of what he has recorded. And this remark applies to the majority of the fragments contained in the volume.

With whatever accuracy history may be written, it will, in the course of time, become obscure in many passages, as those contemporary circumstances which concentrated their light upon it, begin to fade away from the minds of men—things too, which, when the work was produced, were so

well known, that it would scarcely have been pardoned in the historian to have repeated them. His allusions also to things elsewhere, related in works so well known when he was writing, that it required only an allusion to call them up before the mind of the reader, and that in a more pleasing manner than by relating the whole—all conduce, as those contemporary works drop into forgetfulness, to darken the narrative. Explanation becomes necessary: but those who assume the task, under such circumstances, cannot always possess the means of correctly explaining every passage; and most commonly, they will be more willing to have recourse to conjecture than to confess their ignorance. And what is worse, they will not always distinguish their conjectures from the truth. Other passages they may honestly believe that they have explained, while they have themselves been completely mistaken. And sometimes a mistaken view of the general object of a work may lead to a perversion of the whole. All this taking place in times when the commentator did not content himself with annexing his views to the text, but most commonly mingled them up with it, came often with the best intentions in the annotator, to throw an impenetrable obscurity about some ancient writings. Thus it is stated of Sanchoniatho, that “he wrote his history of the Jewish antiquities with the greatest care and fidelity, having received his facts from Hierombalus, a priest, and having a mind to write a universal history of all nations, from the beginning, he took the greatest pains in searching the records of Taautus. But some later writers had corrupted his remains by their allegorical interpretations and physical additions. For the more modern priests or explainers of the Sacra, had omitted to relate the true facts as they were recorded, instead of which, they had obscured them by invented accounts and mysterious fictions, drawn from their notions of the nature of the universe. So that it was not easy for one to distinguish the real facts which Taautus had recorded from the fictions superadded to them. But he, (that is Sanchoniatho) finding some of the books of the Ammonei which were kept in the libraries or registries of the temples, examined every thing with the greatest care; and rejecting the allegories and fables which at first sight offered themselves, he at length brought his work to perfection. But the priests who lived after him, adding their comments and explanations to his work, in some time brought all back to mythology again. Notwithstanding all this, we are not inclined to reject these fragments,

perverted as they thus undoubtedly are, as altogether useless. But when we meet with one coinciding in important points with a professedly historical account, given elsewhere by another hand and in another country, we are disposed to allow considerable weight to its evidence. This, at least, it would seem to prove; that it was not a fiction of their own, but a tradition, common to both countries, which they related. Thus, Sanchoniatho's account of the creation, as given by Eusebius, is as follows: "He supposes that the beginning of all things was a dark and condensed windy air, or a breeze of thick air, and a chaos turbid and black as Erebus; and that these were unbounded, and for a long series of ages destitute of form. But when this wind became enamoured of its own first principles, (the chaos), and an intimate union took place, that connexion was called Pothos—and it was the beginning of the creation of all things. And it (the chaos) knew not its own production; but from its embrace with the wind was generated Môt; which some call Ilus, (mud) but others, the putrefaction of a watery mixture. And from this sprung all the seed of creation and the generation of the universe.

"And there were certain animals without sensation, from which intelligent animals were produced, and these were called Zophasemin, that is, the overseers of the heavens; and they were formed in the shape of an egg; and from Môt shone the sun, and the moon, the less and the greater stars.

"And when the air began to send forth light, by its fiery influence on the sea and earth, winds were produced, and clouds, and very great defluxions and torrents of the heavenly waters. And when they were thus separated, and carried out of their proper places by the heat of the sun, and all met again in the air, and were dashed against each other, thunder and lightning were the result: and at the sound of the thunder, the before mentioned intelligent animals were aroused, and startled by the noise, and moved upon the earth, and in the sea, male and female."

Afterwards he adds, "that these things were found written in the cosmogony of Tautus, and in his commentaries, and were drawn from his observations and the natural signs which, by his penetration, he perceived and discovered, and with which he has enlightened us." Now, however fabulous this account may appear, that there is a ground work of truth in it, we are assured, not only from the coincidences here and there with the Mosaic accounts, but also from the evidence of modern science, that the earth, as is here stated, must have

lain long in a state unfitted for any of those beings who now inhabit it, is demonstrated by the undeniable facts of geology; which, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, is not in opposition to the account given by Moses. For he does not say that God created either man or the other animals at the beginning of the world. He merely states, that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; but as his business is only with the history of man, he enters not into any account of the length of time which the earth lay without form and void, or how long the darkness was upon the face of the deep before the sun and moon were called into existence, and the land and water were separated and both fitted for the habitation of those beings who now occupy them.*

The next fragment, namely, the *Generations*, has much of the same character. Snatches of truth, evidently forming the ground-work; and the genius of Sanchoniatho, or more probably his commentators, having so connected and modified them, as to give them a symbolical meaning.

After Sanchoniatho, we have no historian of these countries until the fourth century, B. C., when the writings of Berosus and Manetho appeared. They were contemporaries. Berosus was a Babylonian, and in the time of Alexander the Great, was priest of Belus. Having obtained a knowledge of the Greek language, most probably from the Macedonians who accompanied Alexander, he removed to the Island of Cos, where he taught astronomy and astrology, and acquired so much celebrity among the Greeks, that a statute is said to have been raised to him at Athens, with a gilded tongue, as expressive of his accurate and wonderful predictions. Besides several other works, he wrote a history of Babylonia, in three books, which included also the history of the Medes. This work was extant in the time of Josephus, who has made considerable use of it in the compilation of his work upon Jewish antiquities, but nothing now remains except the quotations of Josephus, Abydenus, and later writers. He professes to have taken his facts from public records, and from chronicles, preserved in the temple of Belus. And doubtless, his office gave him access to authorities

* The authority of Berosus is also to the point—"There was a time in which there existed nothing but darkness and an abyss of waters, wherein resided most hideous beings, which were produced of a two-fold principle."

the most trust-worthy to be found, since in all countries and ages the priesthood have shown themselves the most faithful guardians of literature. Notwithstanding the leaven of fiction has no less modified the facts in these than in the preceding fragments. Thus, "he mentions that there were written accounts preserved at Babylon with the greatest care, comprehending a period of above fifteen myriads of years;" which piece of information certainly does not conduce to strengthen our belief in what he is about to draw from them. But not to judge of facts *a priori*, we shall exhibit a specimen of those accounts, and allow it to speak for itself. He tells us that "in the first year, there appeared from that part of the Erythraean sea, which borders upon Babylonia, an animal destitute of reason,* by name Oannes, whose whole body was that of a fish; that under the fish's head, he had another head, with feet also below, similar to those of a man, subjoined to the fish's tail. His voice, too, and language, was articulate and human, and a representation of him is preserved even to this day."

This being was accustomed to pass the day among men; but took no food at that season; and he gave them an insight into letters, and sciences, and arts of every kind. He taught them to construct cities, to found temples, to compile laws, and explained to them the principles of geometrical knowledge. He made them distinguish the seeds of the earth, and showed them how to collect the fruits; in short, he instructed them in every thing which could tend to soften their manners and humanize their lives. From that time, nothing material has been added by way of improvement to his instructions. And when the sun had set, this Oannes retired again into the sea, and passed the night in the deeps; for he was amphibious. After this there appeared other animals like Oannes of which Berosus proposes to give an account when he comes to the history of the kings.

Of this passage the Editor remarks. "Unconscious that Noah is represented under the character of Oannes, Berosus describes him, from the hieroglyphical delineation, as a being literally compounded of a fish and a man, and as passing the natural instead of the diluvian night in the ocean, with other circumstances indicative of his character and life,"—probably as good as any other explanation which could now

* Certainly a very calumnious epithet when applied to a being who seems to have taught the Babylonian the use of reason, but so it is ἀφρον.

be given, though its worth may be judged of from the following passages, in which Noah is introduced under quite a different character, and at a different period. "This is the History which Berosus has transmitted to us. He tells us that the first king was Alorus of Babylon, a Chaldean. He reigned ten Sari:* and afterward Alaparus and Amelon, who came from Pantibiblon: then Ammenon the Chaldean, in whose time appeared the Musarus Oannes the Annedotus from the Erythraean sea. Then succeeded Megalarus from the city of Pantibiblon; and he reigned eighteen sari: and after him Daonus the shepherd from Pantibiblon reigned ten sari. In his time appeared again from the Erythraean sea a fourth Annedotus, having the same form with those above, the shape of a fish blended with that of a man. Then reigned Euedorachus from Pantibiblon, for the term of eighteen sari; in his days there appeared another personage from the Erythraean sea like the former, having the same complicated form between a fish and a man, whose name was Odacon. Then reigned Amempsinus, a Chaldean from Laranchae, and he being the eighth in order, reigned ten sari. Then reigned Otiartes, a Chaldean from Laranchae, and he reigned eight sari. And upon the death of Otiartes, his son Xisuthrus reigned eighteen sari: in his time happened the great deluge. So that the sum of all the kings is ten, and the term which they collectively reigned an hundred and twenty sari."

The following extract, which is interesting from its remarkable similarity to the Mosaic account of the deluge, is decisive against the above mentioned remark concerning the Oannes. "After the death of Ardates, his son Xisuthrus reigned eighteen sari. In his time happened the great deluge; the history of which is thus described. The Deity Cornus, appeared to him in a vision, and warned him that upon the fifteenth day of the month Daesius there would be a flood, by which mankind would be destroyed. He therefore enjoined him to write a history of the beginning, procedure and conclusion of all things; and to bury it in the city of the sun at Sippara, and to build a vessel, and take with him into it his friends and relations, and to convey on board every thing necessary to sustain life, together with all the different animals, both birds and quadrupeds, and trust himself fearlessly to the deep. Having asked the Deity, whither he was

* Saros.

to sail? he was answered, 'To the Gods,' upon which he offered up a prayer for the good of mankind. He then obeyed the divine admonition; and built a vessel five stadia in length, and two in breadth. Into this he put every thing which he had prepared: and last of all he conveyed into it his wife, his children, and his friends.

"After the flood had been upon the earth and was in time abated, Xisuthrus sent out birds from the vessel; which not finding any food nor any place whereon they might rest their feet, returned to him again. After an interval of some days, he sent them forth a second time; and they now returned with their feet tinged with mud. He made a trial a third time with these birds; but they returned to him no more, from whence he judged that the surface of the earth had appeared above the waters. He therefore made an opening in the side of the vessel, and upon looking out found that it was stranded upon the side of some mountain, upon which he immediately quitted it with his wife, his daughter and the pilot. Xisuthrus then paid his adoration to the earth: and having constructed an altar, offered sacrifices to the Gods, and with those who had come out of the vessel with him, disappeared.

"They who remained within, finding that their companions did not return, quitted the vessel with many lamentations, and called continually on the name of Xisuthrus. Him they saw no more; but they could distinguish his voice in the air, and hear him admonish them to pay due regard to religion, and likewise informed them that it was upon account of his piety that he was translated to live with the Gods; that his wife and daughter, and the pilot, had obtained the same honour. To this he added, that they should return to Babylonia; and as it was ordained, search for the writings at Sippara, which they were to make known to all mankind: moreover, that the place wherein they then were, was the land of Armenia. The rest, having heard these words, offered sacrifices to the Gods; and taking a circuit, journeyed towards Babylonia.

"The vessel being thus stranded in Armenia, some part of it yet remains in the Corcyrean mountains of Armenia; and the people scrape off the bitumen, with which it had been outwardly coated, and make use of it by way of an alexipharmic and amulet. And when they returned to Babylon, and had found the writings at Sippara, they built cities and erected

temples; and Babylon was thus inhabited again." Syncel. Chron. 28. Euseb. Chron. 5, 8.*

Manetho, whom we have named as contemporary with Berosus, was an Egyptian of Heliospolis, also a priest and expounder of the sacred mysteries at Sebennytus. At the command of Ptolemey Philadelphus, he composed a history of Egypt from the records preserved in the temples, and from ancient inscriptions. The work was divided into three books, and brought down the history of that country from the earliest ages to the time of Darius Codomanus, the last king of Persia. It contained a list of thirty-one dynasties, consisting of three hundred and fifty-two kings, who reigned during a period of 5471 years, which duration, being inconsistent with scripture chronology, has given rise to considerable discussion. The difficulty, however, seems to be solved by Marsham, who shows that many of the earlier dynasties reigned simultaneously in different parts of Egypt, by which he reduces the period to very nearly a consistency with the septuagint.† Manetho wrote also a work on Egyptian theology, an astronomical work entitled the Book of Sothis, which he addressed to Ptolemey Philadelphus, and an Epitome of Physics.

Fragments of his history have been preserved by Eusebius and Syncellus, of which the most important is the dynasties.

The following is the account of this writer given by Eusebius. "It remains, therefore, to make certain extracts concerning the dynasties of the Egyptians, from the writings of Manetho the Sebennyte, the high priest of the idolatrous temple of Egypt in the time of Ptolemaeus Philadelphus. These, according to his own account, he copied from the inscriptions which were engraved in the sacred dialect, and hieroglyphic characters, upon the columns set up in the

* From the preceding extracts it will be perceived that wherever there is no coincidence with any scripture narrative, the story is perfectly dark, and to its meaning we can find no key; but where the same occurrence is related, as in some passage of the bible, while we feel the confirmation which it affords of the sacred account, we have something like confidence in distinguishing what may be true in it, besides those points which coincide with the scripture history. In this manner alone can these remains, universally mingled with fable as they are, be of any account as historical documents.

† This, however, is not taking the testimony of Manetho, but bending it before that of the bible. If, therefore, it is more correct after this modification, it could by itself have only tended to propagate error; for nobody would have thought of such an artifice as Marsham's, had not a more credible account been opposed to this.

Siriadic land,* by Thoth,† the first Hermes; and after the deluge, translated from the sacred dialect into the Greek tongue in hieroglyphic characters; and committed to writing in books, and deposited by Agathodaemon, the son of the second Hermes, the father of Tat, in the penetralia of the temples of Egypt. He has addressed and explained them to Philadelphus, the second king that bore the name of Ptolemaeus, in the book which he has entitled *Sothis*.”

Megasthenes, the author of the fragments upon Judea, was a Greek in the employ of Seleucus Nicator of Syria, by whom he was sent out to Palibothra in Judea, in order to complete some treaty with the inhabitants of that country. Here he remained for several years; and upon his return, wrote an account of his travels, and what he found worthy of note during his residence in Judea. Of this writer, also, we have only some fragments preserved by the same means as the foregoing. Megasthenes was contemporary with Manetho and Berosus, and but a little the senior of Abydenus, who afterwards wrote a history of Syria, and various other historical works. In his work upon Syria he has copied a few passages from Megasthenes, which by a singular fortune, are thus preserved, while the treatise into which they were copied has itself been lost.

The fragment of the Carthaginian historian Hiempsal, which Sallust has copied into his history of the war with Jugurtha, is too well known to need any remark. Such are the principal ancient historians of the gentile world of whom we possess any remains. And the meagerness of these would add but little to our knowledge, had we not some clearer light by which to distinguish, from their fable, their scattered and

* Of the Siriadic columns here mentioned, Josephus thus writes: “All these (the sons of Seth), being naturally of a good disposition, lived happily in the land without apostatizing, and free from any evils whatsoever: and they studiously turned their attention to the knowledge of the heavenly bodies and their configuration. And lest their science should at any time be lost among men, and what they had previously acquired should perish (inasmuch as Adam had acquainted them that an universal aphanism, or destruction of all things, would take place, alternately, by the force of fire, and the overwhelming powers of water), they erected two columns, the one of brick and the other of stone, and engraved upon each of them their discoveries; so that in case the brick pillar should be dissolved by the water, the stone one might survive to teach men the things engraved upon it, and at the same time inform them that a brick one had formerly been also erected by them. It remains even to the present day in the land of Siriad.

† Thoth he computes to have lived in the beginning of the first dynasty. A singular source certainly from which to copy the history of all the succeeding.

imperfect exhibitions of truth. Although they do not come directly under the design of this essay, it may not be amiss in this place to take notice of one or two of the more ancient philosophical or miscellaneous fragments. As they will go to show that that vague and indefinite manner of writing, as also the habit of mingling the fabulous with the true, was in early times not confined to history alone. One of the most interesting relicts of antiquity, which the volume contains, is the *Periplus of Hanno*, which is an account of a voyage undertaken at the command of the Carthaginian government, with the view of discovering new countries, and planting new colonies. The date of this expedition, it is now impossible to ascertain with precision. Fabricius thinks that it must have been about 300 years, B. C. Campomanes places it about the year 407, B. C. Bougainville about 570 years before our era, and others again are for placing it as high as 1000 years before Christ. The only means of making even an approximation to the true date, seems to be that passage of Pliny which states that Hanno and Hamilcon were appointed at the same time, the one to the south, and the other to the north of the Carthaginian Republic, during the time when that state was in its highest degree of prosperity. Now it would seem to be necessary only to find when, under these circumstances, a Hanno and Hamilcon came together at the head of government. And this is the means used to obtain the desired date, which might be satisfactory enough if we could also be assured that only one Hanno and one Hamilcon of distinction ever existed in Carthage together. But when we know that these names were very common in Carthage (so much so that few as we know of her citizens we have the names of some half dozen Hannos of distinction,) it is but arriving at an uncertainty after all. There appears to us, however, most probability in that computation, which places it between five and six hundred years before the Christian era. It was written in the Punic language, but very early translated into Greek. The Punic original, which was deposited by Hanno in the temple of Saturn, has been lost in the universal wreck of Carthaginian literature, but the authenticity of the Greek translation has been supported by the ablest scholars. With regard to the Sybilline Oracles, controversy has long resulted in a conviction of their spuriousness. That some of these fragments called Sybilline verses, are of high antiquity, there can be very little doubt, since we find them cited by Heraclitus five hundred years before the Christian era; and on this account, they possess great

interest as being remains of the literature of those early times. These Sybilline books, are also cited by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and some of the early fathers, many of whom considered them to be genuine prophecies vouchsafed by the Almighty to the Heathen world as those recorded in the Scriptures were to the Jews. There can be very little doubt, nevertheless, that the most of them are forgeries, and that of a comparatively modern date. A few at least, certainly ancient, are inserted in this volume.

Zoroaster is one of the greatest names of antiquity, connected with which every fragment is interesting; but so little certainty can be obtained on the subject of either the man or his works, that critics differ even with regard to the age in which he lived, by little less than two thousand years. And some go even so far as to deny his existence altogether. While some place him upwards of 2500 years, B. C., others are for bringing him down as low as five or six hundred years before the same era. Others maintain that there were two of the name. The first of whom they say was an astronomer, who lived at Babylon, about 2549 years, B. C. The second, a Persian, who restored the religion of the Magi, they place, some 587 and others 519 years, B. C. Others again suppose that there were many lawgivers, and philosophers of that name. What has been given to the world, in a French translation, as the *Zendavesta* of Zoroaster, is considered of but doubtful authority. The fragments contained in the volume before us, must be allowed at least the merit of antiquity; having been pressed in the quotations of several ancient writers. As to the Orphic fragments, that they are ancient is the most that can with certainty be said of them.

In reference to ancient history, these remains do little more than render more sensible the palpable darkness which surrounds the subject, whenever the light of inspiration has not shone upon the eye of the historian; and while the records of every other country are enveloped in extravagance, down to a comparatively late period, those of the Bible are clear, simple, and consistent, even from the creation. If from those nations, the remains of whose history we have been considering, we look to the Chinese, or the Hindus, both of whom pretend to records of great antiquity, we find those records so mingled up and perverted by fable, that it is almost impossible to secure a single historical truth really ancient, from the hideously distorted mass. Nay, so utterly inconsistent are they with themselves, that it requires no contending truth to prove their obscurity; and in extravagance so far

beyond the capacity of the most credulous, that even those who place faith in them, are compelled, out of respect to their own reason, to understand them allegorically. Amidst such masses of fable, the few sprinklings of truth which may exist, would never be discovered to be such, did we not possess some more trust-worthy coincident information. In such connection they are useful, but in such connection alone.

The Scripture record, on the contrary, not only is consistent with itself, but found to be confirmed and elucidated by every truth which bears upon the subjects of which it treats. And not the least wonderful thing connected with it is the perfectness of its preservation, in being entire and unperverted by interpretations, though, to all appearance, it had no better chance of safety than many other works of antiquity, also considered of divine origin by those nations who possessed them. But then many of the priesthood could not but be aware that their holy books, as well as their religion, were very much a fabrication of some of their own class, and intended only as an instrument in government, and therefore could feel no check upon them in making any change, or putting any construction upon them, which they found expedient; whereas the highest of the Jewish priests were those who the most thoroughly believed in the divine nature of their religious books. The care which the Jewish commentators, therefore, took to keep their annotations apart from the text, and the jealousy with which the religious parties among them guarded against the interpolation of the others, no doubt aided much in the preservation of their purity; but nothing short of a heavenly origin can account for the fact, that while the records of other nations pretending to high antiquity are exposed and shamed, as the light of science falls upon them, those very discoveries seem to have been reserved for these later days, to establish and elucidate such passages of the sacred volume as begin to grow dim from the shade of antiquity, the withering up of the delicacies of language, and the changes which are ever passing upon human things. Nay, it is not too much to say, that we, in this present day, better comprehend many passages of scripture, than the people could possibly have done to whom they were at first delivered. So that, if we are not favoured as they were, with the immediate presence of God, we know more concerning his works, and can more clearly comprehend his designs. The fulfillment of prophecy has revealed its meaning, the monuments of antiquity made to render up the

records long hid beneath their mystic symbols, have borne testimony to the accuracy of sacred history, and every science, as soon as it dawns upon the human mind, sends forth a ray to elucidate some statement of the inspired penmen. And even these imperfect relics, as far as their truth can be discovered, all conduce to render our religion more and more an argument to control the reason, even in its worldly wisdom.

Travels in South Eastern Asia, embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam and China, with Notices of Numerous Missionary Stations, and a full account of the Burman Empire, with Dissertations, Tables, &c. By Howard Malcom. In two vols. Third Edition. Boston, Gould, Kendal & Lincoln, 1839.

WE are satisfied, on good grounds, that very inadequate, and even erroneous, views prevail in the Christian community, in regard to the character and condition of the heathen, and the nature and results of missionary labour. These misconceptions are much to be regretted in their bearing upon the feelings, the hopes, the contributions, and the prayers of the churches; but they are especially so in their influence on candidates for the work of missions. They lead to the adoption of plans, and beget expectations which cannot be realized, and which consequently produce sad disappointments. Instances might even be cited where individuals have been led to abandon in despair a service which they undertook under such great misapprehension; and, perhaps, almost every missionary has experienced more or less of the painful conflict of feeling, attendant on the overturning of his preconceived notions, before his zeal and his hopes, come to rest upon the true basis, which nothing can even afterwards shake. Not only is all this undesirable, but it is wholly unnecessary. By this we mean, that the cause of missions does not stand in need of all or any of the misrepresentations, which have become so current, especially in anniversary addresses. Some of the points on which we believe exaggerated views are entertained, are the cruelty and wretchedness of the heathen, the desire for Christian instruction, and especially for books, the change of feeling as it regards Chris-

tianity, and the perfection and usefulness of the tracts and translations of the Bible now in use. We are well aware of the difficulty of conveying accurate impressions of things by mere description, and most of the erroneous notions alluded to have been wholly unintentional. A missionary, in describing what he sees among the heathen, is obliged to use the terms appropriated to the same objects in America, while there may be something in those objects, or circumstances connected with them, which require great modifications in the meaning of the terms. Thus, for example, he speaks of a college in India, of the senior and junior classes, of literary graduates, and immediately the mind of his reader forms to itself the idea of a college, a senior or junior student, or a batchelor of arts as they exist in America; while in reality the thing in question is so very different, as to require a different name entirely, if such a name could be found. The extent of the misunderstanding arising from this change in the meaning of terms, as applied to objects in India and America, can scarcely be perceived without personal experience of the difficulty.

Another fruitful source of wrong impressions is this. The missionary, or traveller, in describing the character of the heathen, for example, does so mainly by the statement of facts. In selecting his facts, he, of course, takes such as are remarkable, in order that they may strike the community with more force. Thus *extreme* cases become the best known, and come to be regarded as a *fair average* of the truth. What is *peculiar* and *rare*, is supposed to be *characteristic* and *common*. It is in this way that so much injustice has been done to us as a nation, by travellers from Europe; and quite as great injustice, in our opinion, has been done to the heathen, in the impressions of their character, which prevail in the religious world. Our feelings are often shocked by the recital of deeds of horror perpetrated in some heathen land; and we are too apt to consider them as characteristic of heathenism. We forget that such things are neither common nor peculiar to heathen countries; but liable to occur even among ourselves. In all the political evils of the heathen world, there are few evincing more cold-blooded cruelty than the horrors of the French revolution. The celebrated system of Thuggy, in India, its master piece in rapine and murder may almost find a parallel in the famous secret league so long the terror of Germany, or the inhuman marauders under the Italian Gasparoni. Even its horrid licentiousness might nearly be matched, by the disclosure of the deeds of infamy

which exist in our own cities. And almost as often are our feelings harrowed by the recital of husbands and fathers beating, murdering and burning their own wives and children, in a fit of beastly intoxication. All this is not the distinctive character of any nation, heathen or otherwise, but the result of human nature phrenzied by wild and wicked passions, and belongs to the records of every age and every country. Certain it is, that any one who takes his impressions of heathen character from the current descriptions of it, will be agreeably surprised to find them, on acquaintance, a sober, civil, rational, and often kind and generous set of men and women, just like other people. They are partakers of the same human nature, men of like passions with ourselves; and every man has in his own bosom, before the grace of God takes possession of it, a specimen, which may give him a better idea of the heart of his fellow man in heathen lands, than most of the representations which are current in the community.

Even the religious character of the heathen, grievously defective as it is, we apprehend is not well understood. There is more attachment to their religion, more faithfulness to its requirements, and more confidence in its efficacy, than we are apt to suppose. There is also less absurdity, by far, in their religious systems, *as they understand them*, than appears to us in the light in which we view them. One cannot overthrow their idolatry, for instance, by the course of argument which satisfies his own mind, and much less by mere sallies of ridicule or sarcasm. They can defend it most ingeniously and powerfully, on the same principles, and by almost the identical arguments with which a Catholic justifies the use of pictures in devotion. And any one who feels able to prostrate the gods of the heathen, in the field of debate, would do well first to prove his armor in argument with a well educated and ingenious Catholic. We misunderstand their views when we think them fraught with such absurdity. There is much truth mingled with their errors; enough to make them highly plausible, and difficult to refute. No mind of common sense, to say nothing of acuteness, (and the heathen have both,) would or could adopt the gross absurdity which is commonly imputed to them. The unexperienced disputant soon discovers this, and must stand about on another tack, before he can make headway with his opponents.

This is particularly the case with the acute and wily disciples of Mohammed. Witness their controversies with Martyn. We would particularly commend to the attention

of all who may be interested in this subject, the discussions alluded to, as collected and published by Prof. Lee. Though conducted with all the learning and ability of a finished scholar, gifted with the highest honours of one of the best Universities in the world, yet was the victory so uncertain, that the learned Professor expresses strong doubts, whether the least advantage was gained by the cause of truth. Nor are they by any means afraid of argument. They delight in it, and approach it with seeming confidence of success. We have known them to challenge the best qualified advocates of Christianity to public debate; and we repeat that those who expect ever to enter the lists with them, should study the subject deeply, and master it fully, before they venture to the field.

There is another topic deserving of remark in this connexion. There is neither so entire nor so universal a destitution of social duties and practical religious precepts, as might be inferred from the general statements in which it is common to indulge. It would be easy to cite some of the most touching cases of filial, parental and fraternal affection from heathen families. Perhaps there is no nation on the earth, where these so well deserve to be called *national* virtues, as in China. They are inculcated from the earliest infancy, and enforced by the strongest motives and heaviest penalties. They form the very basis of the whole political structure. It is a surprising fact, perhaps not generally known, that the Chinese code of morals inculcates some of the precepts which we are accustomed to think peculiar to the great Teacher of Christianity. The golden rule of religion "all things whatsoever ye would men should do to you, do ye even so to them," may be found in almost as many words in the precepts of Confucius—the proud boast of Chinese philosophy. Nor is it barely stated, but illustrated and enforced, both by reasoning and example. So also with the duty of forgiveness and love to enemies. The rules of morality acknowledged by the heathen, when compared with the Christian code, are extremely defective in the details, and grossly lax in practice. The grand difference is, that they do not, as the law of God does, *take hold upon the heart*. Hence arise a thousand subterfuges in the conduct of life, and deceit in every form is sanctioned whenever *concealment* is possible.

But it is time for us to state the bearing of these remarks on the work of Mr. Malcom. In reference to these several

topics, and some others of still more importance yet to be adverted to, we have been disappointed in these volumes. We had expected from the graphic powers of the author, and his opportunities of personal observation, to find a picture of the heathen world, not only accurate in the outlines, but true to life in its very shadings. But though he has made a strong impression on our mind, of honesty of design throughout, yet we are disappointed in a good many instances with the execution. There are marks of both haste and confusion; and like rapid travellers, he has often been deceived by appearances, and allowed the common train of thought and remark to carry off his own judgment. Unless we are ourselves mistaken, the impressions of the character and condition of the heathen, which a common reader will gather from his pages, are not such as familiar personal acquaintance will verify. Their effect will not be to clear away erroneous notions, and define with clearness and truth the grounds on which the plans and the hopes of missionaries should rest. He leaves candidates for the work of missions, in possession of the same vague, and often false, views of the character of the people, and the kind, quality and results of the labour to which they have devoted themselves. His book will not have the tendency to the extent we had hoped, to chasten and correct the expectations of the Christian community, and give them clear and correct views of the work of missions, and the real motives and encouragements to enlist and persevere in it.

This was one of the leading advantages we had expected from the visit of Mr. Malcom to the missionary stations of India and China. But the extent to which, in our apprehension, he has failed, in removing errors and defining and impressing truth, may give rise to a question as to the utility of a delegation, at least for purposes of information. The visit of such a personage is so cursory, that he is obliged in most cases to depend upon the statements and opinions of others, which might be transmitted without his intervention; or if he depends upon his own observation, he is liable, through haste, to grievous impositions and mistakes.

Perhaps we shall not have a better opportunity to correct a train of remark into which superficial observation has led him, than to introduce it in the way of illustrating what we have just said. We allude to the comparison instituted between Catholic and Protestant Missionaries in regard to salaries. It is stated that "the entire salary of a Catholic priest is one hundred dollars per annum," while that of American

missionaries, who are married, is six or seven times that amount. The inference from this comparison is any thing but fair. We have means of knowing to a certainty, that the former are the better provided for of the two. The fact is, their "one hundred dollars" is nearly that sum of *pocket money*, over and above their expenses; while American missionaries have an allowance *barely sufficient* to cover their expenses. The clothing of the Catholic priest is generally sent to him from Europe, besides numerous luxuries, including wines, unknown to our missionaries; while the peculiar tenets of the Catholic creed require the laity to supply all necessary subsistence and service to the clergy even *gratuitously*. We have no hesitation in saying that they live better, and have more menial offices performed for them, than most American Protestant missionaries with a salary of six hundred dollars. By having their expenses thus covered, one hundred may be considered a liberal allowance for contingent expenses. This is but a *specimen* of the erroneous impressions and injustice which may result from superficial observation, or the *partial* statement of facts. While Mr. Malcom seems to be sincerely anxious to do justice to the spirit and character of our missionaries, yet he more than insinuates that their mode of living borders on extravagance. We are not surprised that a cursory traveller should have come to this conclusion, but we are satisfied that it is *erroneous*; and a residence of a single year in any one place in India would have convinced him that it is so.

We believe that the error of our missionaries, if there be one, is on the other extreme. Such is the unanimous opinion of the English, and all who have resided in India for a series of years. American missionaries expend the least of any class of labourers in that field;—less than *one seventh* of the allowance of chaplains in the East India Company's service; and the consequence is, that they encounter toils and exposures which greatly impair their strength and usefulness, and shorten their days. Does the number of lamented deaths chronicled in our missionary periodicals, the multitude who return home with broken constitutions, worn out in the freshness of their youth, indicate indolence or ease? We cannot but regard this as a matter of vast moment, in the conduct of missions. It is miserable policy, viewing it even in the cold light of expediency, to send missionaries to India, at great expense, and require them, with the view of saving a few

rupees, to perform their own laborious menial offices, in that exhausting climate. We have in our own eye this moment, missionaries, who have encountered toils and exposures, contrary to their own judgment, and the remonstrances and expostulations of old residents, partly to avoid the *appearance* of extravagance, and partly to curtail their expenses a trifle; and the fatal consequences are on record, to the discouragement and dismay of the church, and unjustly charged to the deadly nature of the climate. We should be as anxious as Mr. M. not to foster extravagance or indolence; but we are satisfied to entrust this matter to the consciences of our missionaries, and our decided conviction is, that *in general* (there may be individual exceptions), the exhortation is much more needed to economise their *strength* rather than their funds. The cases are alarmingly frequent, when missionaries, by the time they have acquired enough of the native language to fit them for usefulness, are so worn down by excessive labour, and injudicious exposure, that their acquirements are nearly lost to the cause; and very often indeed, if they do not sink into a premature grave, they are compelled to abandon their field, and return to the lighter duties of the ministry at home. The difference between the habits and expenses of missionaries and ordinary foreign residents in India, is much greater than between ministers and lay gentlemen in America; and yet, if there be a case conceivable, where money should be subservient to health and vigour, it is that of a missionary in India.

There is another subject which we feel bound to notice, and yet we hesitate to do so, not because our own opinions are unsettled, but because we are afraid of misapprehension. In speaking of the measure of missionary success, frequently throughout the book, and again in a chapter devoted to the purpose, while Mr. Malcom's estimate, on the whole, is perhaps not excessive; yet some of his statements are adapted to mislead. We may cite merely as an instance (and we could add many others), the account of the Serampore mission, vol. 2, p. 45. "Few in number, and sustained by their own resources, the missionaries have given the world the whole Bible in Sanscrit, Chinese, Bengalee, Hindu, Mahratta, Oriya, Sikh Pushtu or Afghan, Cashmere and Assamee; and the New Testament in the Gujeratee, Kunkun, Multanee, Bikaner, Bhugulcund, Maruar, Nepaul, Harotee, Kanoja, Mugudh, Oojuyine, Iumbo, Bhutneer,

Munipore, Bruj, Kemaon, Shreenagur, and Palpa; besides portions of the New Testament in various other languages." Now the *whole* truth in the case is, that *very few* of this long catalogue are sufficiently correct to admit of distribution, though there are thousands and tens of thousands of copies lying in warerooms in Calcutta; and a considerable portion of these versions, made almost wholly by unconverted natives, who did not understand what they undertook to translate, are so grievously deficient, that they cannot be used even as a *basis* for a new translation.

This statement is not made at random; for we have known cases where the skill of the best pundits, assisted by the knowledge of the missionary of what it should be, was often unable to discover an idea approaching the meaning of the original. One of this catalogue of versions was in a language which has never yet been found in any part of India. This curious fact places the moral character of the natives engaged in this work, in as doubtful a predicament, as their intellectual qualifications. The extreme uncertainty of this method of proceeding will appear from the specimen which Mr. M. gives us himself, of the translation of 1 Cor. 5: 6, "a little crocodile crocodileth the whole lump." How judicious it is, every one may judge for himself, when informed that the Chinese version, which cost years of intense study, and more than *a hundred thousand dollars*, is now scarcely heard of, except in reports from the Serampore depository. It is nowhere used for distribution, so far as we are informed, unless it be among the few Chinese, mostly expatriated convicts, in Calcutta and Bombay.

It is hardly necessary to say that these remarks are not dictated by any want of respect for the characters implicated. They were holy men; and as missionaries, perhaps never surpassed, and but seldom equalled, in point of talents and devotedness. Their praise is deservedly in all the churches. But it is no more than proper, that the churches should know that this immense work is yet to be done, so that they may not be disappointed when they find many more labourers and vast additional expense necessary to its completion. The lesson furnished by the number and extent of this kind of failures, ought not to be lost to future, and especially to young missionaries. We can hardly conceive of a piece of history illustrating more strongly the importance of concentrated and thorough effort, rather than diffused and superficial, of doing

a few things or even *one* thing well rather than attempting many great objects and completing none.

There is a vague notion in the minds of most candidates for missionary labour, and which the statements of Mr. M. tend rather to foster than discourage, that their efforts are to be on a vastly larger scale than if they were to remain at home;—that they are to do good by *wholesale*, to operate upon *nations* instead of petty parishes of a few hundred souls. These notions are essentially romantic; and if indulged, will be sure to result in sad disappointment. We cannot help thinking that the sanguine and prophetic strains, in which it is common to indulge in books, and sermons, and especially in anniversary speeches, on the successes of missions, are unhappy, and too often groundless. They produce vain self-confidence on the part of churches, and excite false anticipations in those who are looking to personal engagement in the work. Missionaries must not expect to operate at once on large masses of people. They must not expect to be hailed by waiting nations, and beset with anxious cries for the bread of life. They must be content to be brought in contact with *individual* minds, and even those encased in ignorance and prejudice. They must expect to labour with careless men, often disgusting in degradation, and ready to treat with neglect and scorn their kindest attempts to do them good. They must expect all the difficulties and discouragements incident to the life of one who strives to win souls to Christ. This was the lot of the Master himself while on earth, and he gave his disciples no reason to expect better treatment. The heart, warm with his spirit, will count it its highest honour and happiness to share in this very kind of toil. Missionaries should know beforehand that this is what they are to expect in going to the heathen; and if they shrink from the work, so be it. They had better not go. They are not “of the manner of spirit” needed for this work. It is worse than useless to disguise the truth. Let them understand distinctly, that they are going to prophecy in a valley full of bones, which are *very dry*; and let them have their faith stayed upon God’s promise and power, or they had better not attempt it at all.—The church too, on her part, must be content to send her ministers out to do this unpromising work, and pray for them with all the faith necessary to support them under these discouraging labours. And when the church and her missionaries come to feel aright, humbled as to their own ability, and the wisdom and efficacy of their own resources, and

cry mightily to God, we shall soon hear of a shaking among the dry bones;—bone coming to his bone and flesh covering them, an exceeding great army arising in “the valley of vision.”

If we could gain the ear of our missionaries abroad, we would suggest the necessity of great caution in transmitting their reports, and especially *isolated facts* to the churches at home. They are strongly tempted to portray their pictures in the highest colouring that truth will admit, in order to encourage their patrons; and then the effect is greatly increased by the false inferences which we draw from these facts, from our ignorance of attending and qualifying circumstances. In almost every instance, when we have had opportunities of verifying the result, the impressions thus created varied from the truth. It is almost impossible for us at home to make the allowances which are in the mind of the missionary, and hence his statements are liable to convey ideas widely different from those intended. The erroneous calculations, false hopes and consequent disappointments which ensue, enforce the necessity of extreme caution, in representing the condition and prospects of missionary stations.

There are still a number of points in the work before us to which we felt anxious to call attention; but our limits require us to pass on to the last chapter, on “the mode of conducting modern missions.” This, indeed, is obviously the most important subject in the book, and the enlightened discussion of it, was the second leading advantage we had expected from the opportunities of personal observation, enjoyed by Mr. M. But while we find in it some very judicious observations, we are compelled again to express disappointment. So far as he embodies the opinions of old and experienced missionaries, his suggestions have weight; but in most of the points where he assails those opinions, his very cursory observation, and entire want of experience, are very apparent; and from some of his conclusions, we dissent entirely.

We feel particularly dissatisfied with the discussion on the subject of schools and education; and the comparison of these with preaching, as a means of usefulness. Mr. M. does not seem to us to understand the true nature and object of this kind of missionary labour. In the comparison alluded to, he has certainly given us a complete specimen of what lawyers call “a false issue.” Nearly all that is said in favour of preaching, in contrast with a system of education,

is founded on the mistaken notion that they are *antagonist* means of accomplishing the same object; and that to justify the present attention paid to education, it must be proved, that "where the preaching of the gospel makes one Christian, education makes ten." All this is misconception. Christian education does indeed make many Christians directly, but the grand object of the system is to raise up an agency for preaching the gospel and to prepare the mind to receive it. It is the great means of calling into action and giving efficacy to the very instrumentality, which he extols so much, at the expense of its auxiliary. The real point at issue, is not as to the importance of preaching the gospel, as a means of grace in the conversion of the world, but as to the source whence preachers are to be obtained, and the class of persons and other circumstances most favourable to the efficacy of preaching. To decry schools, and urge missionaries to devote themselves to this work, is, in effect, to affirm that the ministry for the heathen world, must go from Christian countries, and labour indiscriminately with adults. We hold, on the contrary, that preachers must be trained on the spot; and that so far as missionaries do preach, they have the best prospect of usefulness by preaching to the young, and especially to the *educated* youth. Our reasons for the former opinion are, first, a sufficient number of ministers for the purpose cannot be obtained in Christendom; and, secondly, if they could be obtained, they never can be so well qualified for the situation, as well trained natives. The fact is, that a much smaller proportion of missionaries, than is commonly supposed, ever become qualified to preach the gospel with any tolerable ability, in the native languages. Missionaries themselves are often mistaken as to their attainments. Even Dr. Carey, after preaching two years or more, found, to his mortification, that he had never been understood. And it is hardly necessary to say, that much more is necessary than merely to be understood. The preacher must be master of the imagery, trains of thinking, difficulties and objections of those whom he addresses. He must be, what few but natives ever can become, perfectly familiar with the native mind. No conclusion can be clearer, than that the ministry of each nation must be furnished and trained within its own limits; and to effect this, is the grand object of missionaries.

The obvious objection to this train of remark will be that the adult heathen would, in this case, be left to perish. We

answer not *all*, and not *necessarily*. The knowledge of salvation, though not urged upon them all individually, (which it cannot be for want of ministers,) will be within their reach, if they wish to possess it. And if they do not, it is their own fault. But as a fact, they nearly all must and *will* perish. They have been neglected till they are already too far gone to be reached. But the loss will be infinitely more than made up by the greater number of the next generation, who will be saved, through the instrumentality of the great increase of native preachers now in process of training. If all our missionaries were to devote themselves to preaching, and neglect training up future ministers, a few perhaps, and *but a few* more of the adults might be saved; but then the next generation must get their whole supply, like the last, wholly inadequate and unqualified, from Christendom; and neither increase nor permanence would attend the work. And if there is a reason for one person multiplying himself by training many natives for the ministry, the same reason holds good for another; and is an argument for the *system* of schools. Preaching, we admit, is the great means of converting souls, but the question is who are to preach? foreign or native ministers? Shall foreign missionaries give their short and imperfect labours in this service, and leave no permanent agency; or shall they not rather train up tens and scores of native agents and leave behind them self-perpetuating institutions?

Much of Mr. Malcom's reasoning against schools, is reasoning against their *imperfections*, and not against the thing itself. The failures which he has cited, were the fault of the *plans* and *details* of the several systems of education formerly adopted, and not of the system itself as now understood. And the success in Ceylon, which he attributes to protracted meetings in contra-distinction to schools, is the fair result of a judicious and Christian system of education. Religious means, the warmest and most efficient kind, should never be separated from schools; much less should they be arrayed as rival measures in the work of missions.

This, however, introduces another view of the happy effects of education in promoting the cause. Aside from its indispensable importance, in preparing a ministry for the world, its influence is powerful and almost resistless, in preparing the way, and hastening the spread of truth and religion. If our object were not to raise up a native agency, but merely to devote our whole energy to personal effort for

the conversion of individuals, or to preach the gospel with the greatest effect, as Mr. M. contends, we would select the *young* as the subjects of our labour, and we would, as far as possible, first gather them into schools. For this course we have innumerable reasons, and it coincides with the opinion, as the practice proves, of nearly all experienced missionaries. In many places, in fact, there is no other way of obtaining an audience to preach to; and very seldom indeed can the *regular* attendance of any other class of people be secured. And it is of the greatest importance that their attendance should be repeated and constant. The missionary, in public preaching, labours under the serious disadvantage of having a new subject,—one so entirely unknown to his audience, that the fragments which they pick up in going and coming are almost unintelligible. A few sentences will satisfy the restless group that it is uninteresting, and they pass on; hardly deigning to stop a second time, should business even call them that way. How inadequate are these means to warrant the expectation of a general conquest over the opposition and prejudices of human nature! In a Christian land, where it is impossible to escape from all the memorials of religion, where the Sabbath and the sanctuary bring men stately under its warmest influence, and where the convicted conscience lifts its repeated, faithful and pungent warnings on the side of truth, how difficult it is to make a permanent impression! How the mass heedlessly pass on, and perish after all! Now where there is *nothing* of all this, but *every thing* opposed to it, how modest and chastened should be our expectations! It is not from a loss of piety, or devotedness, as Mr. Malcom more than intimates, vol. 2, p. 270, that missionaries have so far abandoned this sort of labour, but because experience has *driven* them to the adoption of other measures.

The system now becoming so general, of training up the young on Christian principles, greatly diminishes the difficulties alluded to, and produces much more extensive permanent and happy results. It affords the opportunity of eliciting and cultivating both the mind and the heart, and of forming the habits; so that while the intellect, under the influence of reason and truth, repudiates the false systems that degrade and fetter the mind educated to believe them, the moral feelings are incomparably more susceptible to the impressions of religion. It seems, also, as a bond to retain them under the influence of the missionary, long enough to obtain

a competent knowledge of the nature and principles of Christianity, and to feel the full power of its vast compass of motives, kept steadily before the mind. A more interested audience, or a more promising class of youth, are not to be found even in Christian countries, than that furnished by the pupils of the several institutions, especially the Scotch College, at Calcutta, or the Mission Seminary at Batticotta.

We differ entirely from our author, in the opinion, that the conversion of an adult heathen is of more importance to the cause of religion, than that of the youth of the schools. We are surprised that his observation has not informed him of the distrust and comparative uselessness of such converts, as agents in the spread of religion, occasioned by inveterately bad habits, and by the remains of the deceit and gross corruptions of heathenism. The immense number of apostacies, and the still greater number of grievous inconsistencies which attend these cases, have been the most fruitful source of discouragement and complaint to every missionary. From all these disadvantages the youthful convert to Christianity is comparatively, and often entirely, free; while his age and intellectual capabilities admit of his becoming an efficient agent in the spread of truth and piety. But it is not merely in furnishing well qualified champions of truth, and ministers of religion, that the conversion and education of the young is specially important; but also in securing the effects of elementary Christian instruction to as many as possible of both sexes of this important class of society. They soon become the influential heads of families, which are trained in their turn on similar principles, under the sanction of parental precept and example. Through each of these, again, branched into numerous descendants, and interwoven in the complicated relations of life, the good leaven may be transmitted, until families, relatives, societies, and finally, it may be hoped, *nations* will feel the extending influence, and the whole be leavened.

The substance then of what we have to say in defence of the existing system of education, is that the young form altogether the most hopeful class of subjects for Christian efforts, that their collection in schools is the best and often the only way of bringing them under the constant, full and continued influence of truth and piety, and that it is of transcendent importance in furnishing a native Christian agency, for perpetuating and extending the institutions, and the spirit of religion. The reason why so little good has heretofore re-

sulted from mission schools, is that the course of instruction was too short, too superficial, and too much disconnected with the incessant, fervent, and prayerful use of the means of grace. The system of Christian education adopted within the last ten years, and now growing into general use, (of which the American Seminary in Ceylon and the Scotch College in Calcutta may be cited as examples,) has already begun to yield most delightful results. Indeed the old systems of education were far from being unproductive of good. Their great defect was that they led to comparatively few conversions to real piety; but their influence in the diffusion of mere scientific truth, is felt throughout the whole of India. The prevalent sentiment of both natives and foreigners would fully bear out the opinion we have lately heard expressed by one of the most acute and accurate observers of the times, that "nothing but a revolution to break up the whole existing organization in India, can prevent it from becoming a Christian country."

Nothing, however, could be farther from our intention, than to intimate that any system of means, however appropriate or well adopted, is sufficient of itself to effect the desired change. No process of education, no kind or amount of preaching, can ever spiritually enlighten or convert a single heathen soul. It may dispel the darkness of the intellect, and demolish by the force of reason, false systems of religion, and yet leave the *heart* untouched. The effect, in such cases, has often been to make men sceptical as to all religions; and at best, it can only convert paganism into *nominal* Christianity. This last, indeed, is no undesirable attainment: but still it falls infinitely short of the object in view,—the conversion of the *souls* of the heathen. To this, no power is adequate but the influence of the Holy Spirit; and no duty is more imperative on the church, none more vital to the success of her efforts to regenerate the world, and yet none more grievously neglected than that of ardent, untiring and believing prayer for the promised gift of the Holy Ghost. This is the "one thing needful," in the present posture of the heathen world. "The way of the Lord" is sufficiently "prepared" in many places, to admit of a glorious and triumphant display of his grace; and the abundant dispensation of this blessing in the Sandwich Islands, and still more recently in the northern provinces of India, seem to indicate that he "waits to be gracious." In view of these illustrations of the promise, that the time is coming when

“nations shall be born in a day,” the church and her missionaries should stir themselves up to plead the fulfilment of that promise, and at the same time tax their utmost energy and resources to educate, and get in readiness, a native ministry; so that the spectacle may not occur again, which is now witnessed in Bengal, of more than fifty villages turning, as one man, from the gods of their fathers, and imploring a teacher to unfold to them the consolations and hopes of the Christian religion, and yet no teacher be found. The whole tenor of the prophecies leads us to anticipate astonishing movements among the nations, and nothing could illustrate more clearly, or enforce more strongly, than such incidents as that alluded to, the necessity of preparing beforehand, and as speedily as possible, a native agency to control them, and to meet the wants they will disclose.

There are two or three other topics in the concluding chapter of the work before us, that we meant to touch upon; but we have already exceeded our intended limits. We cannot, however, refrain from remarking, that we accord most fully, not only in the correctness, but the importance of our author's sentiments in relation to tracts and translations, and missionary physicians. We commend the paragraphs in question to the attention of all who may be in any way interested in the subject; and we could add many important facts, tending to the same conclusion. We are satisfied that these measures should be regarded only, as in a small degree, *subsidiary* to the great plans and operations of the church in the work of missions. They should never be looked upon as prominent, or primary. We fear that the disadvantages attending the use of these means have been overlooked; and that expectations are based upon them, which are destined to disappointment. The facts in the case are but partially known, and false inferences have been drawn. But we cannot go into the subject at present.

We have only to say, in conclusion, that our strictures have been mainly confined to what we deem objectionable features in the mode of presenting this great subject. We have not space to enlarge on the merits of the work under review—and it has its merits. The general plan of the work is excellent; and it embodies an immense mass of facts.

- ART. IV.—1. *The present Conflict between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts Examined, with Historical and Statutory Evidence for the Jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland.* By the Rev. Andrew Gray, A.M. Second Edition. Edinburg, 1839.
2. *Substance of a Speech delivered in the General Assembly, on Wednesday, the twenty-second of May, 1839, respecting the Decision of the House of Lords, on the Case of Auchterarder.* By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. LL.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburg, and Corresponding Member of the Royal Institute of France. Second Thousand. Glasgow, 1839.
3. *Speeches of the Rev. D. Burns, Rev. Robert S. Candlish, and Alexander Earle Monteith, Esq., in the General Assembly, on May 22, 1839, in the Auchterarder Case. With an appendix.* Second Edition. Edinburg, 1839.

It is natural for orthodox Presbyterians, in the United States of America, to feel a lively interest in the continued prosperity of the church of Scotland, for they have derived their existence from that body, and perfectly agree with her in matters of doctrine and discipline; in the forms of worship and church government.

The Presbyterian church in this country, having recently passed through a severe conflict herself, and having been threatened with a serious collision with the civil courts, is prepared to sympathize with the mother-church, in the conflict which she has endured, the issue of which has been so unfavourable to the peace and prosperity of that venerable church.

In the review of these interesting pamphlets, we propose to furnish our readers with a concise, but perspicuous view of the AUCHTERARDER CASE, as it is called: it having originated in the parish and presbytery of Auchterarder.

It is well known to our intelligent readers, that the law of patronage has always been a source of discontent to many persons in the established church of Scotland; and that it has had no small share in increasing the number of dissenters from the church; one respectable body of whom profess no other ground than this for their separation. For more than half a century, the General Assembly had so far taken part with the patrons, and against the people, that when a candidate was presented, they compelled the presbytery to ordain

and introduce him, notwithstanding the opposition of a majority of the people. Such an infringement on the rights of the people, the Scottish spirit, always jealous of religious liberty, could not, with patience, brook. For many years past, earnest complaints, petitions, and remonstrances have been presented to the successive Assemblies, to have this grievance mitigated or removed. At length, and but recently, the continued and systematic efforts of the opposers of the abuses of patronage so far prevailed, that a law was passed by the General Assembly, and then sent down to the presbyteries for their approbation, agreeably to the provisions of the *barrier act*, prohibiting the settlement of any candidate presented by any patron, unless a majority of the lawful voters in the parish were in his favour. This act was proposed by Dr. Chalmers, and received the denomination of the *Veto Act*. But as this whole matter is clearly stated in the speech of A. E. Monteith, Esq., before the General Assembly of May last, it will be best to give the statement in his own words. "In the year 1834, in compliance with a very generally expressed wish of the church, this Assembly passed a declaratory act, commonly known by the name of the *VETO ACT*, embodying a declaration of the principle of the non-intrusion of ministers, or, in other words, that ministers should not be inducted into parishes contrary to the will of the Christian people, as a fundamental and essential principle of the church of Scotland. This law was sent down to presbyteries under the *Barrier Act*, and after being approved by a large majority of those presbyteries, it was declared to be a standing law of the church.

"Whatever doubts may exist as to the policy or expediency of this law, whatever opinions may be entertained respecting its affecting the civil rights of patrons, no man can doubt, that being a law in relation to the constitution of the pastoral relation, it was a law regarding a spiritual matter. At all events, whether right or wrong, expedient or inexpedient, as to which I shall speak presently, it undoubtedly became a law of the church.

"Such being the law of the church, a person by the name of Young received a presentation to the church and parish of Auchterarder, from Lord Kinnoul, the patron of that parish. The presbytery, under the direction of the inferior courts of the church, proceeded to apply the law to the case of Mr. Young, and finding that a large majority of the parish were opposed to him, they refused to take steps for his ordination

or induction. In doing so, it will be remarked, that the presbytery of Auchterarder not only obeyed a standing law, but acted under the immediate advice and direction of the supreme court of the church, to which they had made a reference, and the order of which they could not have disobeyed, without subjecting themselves to ecclesiastical censures, and it might be to deposition.

“Mr. Young, considering himself aggrieved by this decision, had recourse to the civil courts for redress, and having obtained the patron’s concurrence, he instituted that action in the court of session, of which we have heard so much. In that action the presentee did not venture to conclude that the civil courts should order the presbytery to ordain and induct him, which, although truly his object, would have been a proposal too startling to have been made in direct terms. He brought his action in a declaratory form, the leading conclusion on which he insisted, being that the presbytery of Auchterarder had illegally, and in violation of their duty, refused to take him upon trial, and to receive and admit him a minister of the parish.

“Against this action, the leading defence of the presbytery was, that although the court of session had the sole jurisdiction, in so far as regarded the temporalities of the benefice, they had no jurisdiction, in so far as regarded the ordination and induction of the presentee, as, by the statute law of the land, all matters relating to the trial and induction of ministers, were subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the church courts, whose sentences were declared by the legislature to be final and conclusive.

“After a variety of procedure, with which it is unnecessary to detain the house, the same came to be advised. The court were much divided on the subject. Not less than five judges, of whom it is not too much to say, they are excelled by none in learning and intelligence, were decidedly of opinion that the civil courts had no jurisdiction. The majority of the court, however, were of a different opinion, and pronounced a judgment, and find that the presbytery, in rejecting Mr. Young, under the provisions of the Veto Act, had acted illegally, and in violation of their duty; and the case having been appealed, the judgment was ultimately affirmed in the House of Lords. Such, sir, is the present situation of matters in reference to this case. On the one hand, the church courts maintain, that the ordination and induction of Mr. Young are spiritual matters, falling under their exclusive

cognizance, and have decided in regard to them according to what is admitted by every one to be the existing law of the church. On the other hand, the court of session, as the supreme civil court of Scotland, contend, that they not only have jurisdiction in the matter, (which in so far as the civil patrimonial rights of the parties were concerned, was never disputed,) but also, that they have a right to direct and control the ecclesiastical proceedings of the church courts, in the spiritual matters of ordination and induction, on the ground that the civil rights of the presentee to the manse and stipend are affected by them. It is true, that the civil courts have not yet been asked to pronounce a direct order upon the presbytery, to proceed with the ordination and induction, but they have declared that in refusing to proceed, the Presbytery have acted illegally: and if it be true that the Presbytery have acted illegally, and the court of session have a jurisdiction in the matter, beyond the mere temporalities of the benefice, I cannot see any ground for hesitating as to the inference, that the court of session are entitled to order the presbytery to proceed with the ordination and induction of Mr. Young; an order which the presbytery cannot obey, without violating an existing law of the church, and breaking their ordination vows, which bind them to give obedience to that law.

“This was the position of the matter when the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland met, last May. All parties in the church seemed to feel that the position in which they were placed was a very painful one; but in regard to the proper mode of proceeding to avoid a direct collision with the civil courts, there was much diversity of opinion. Three distinct motions in relation to the subject were laid on the table of the Assembly, by the Rev. Dr. Cook, the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, and the Rev. Dr. Muir, respectively. Dr. Cook’s motion, after a preamble, in which the several steps in the legal and ecclesiastical proceedings are stated, contains the following resolution, viz: ‘That the act on calls, commonly called the Veto Act, having been then declared, by the supreme civil tribunals of the country, to infringe on civil and patrimonial rights, with which the church has often and expressly required that its judicatories should not intermeddle, as being matters incompetent to them, and not within their jurisdiction, it be an instruction by the General Assembly to all presbyteries, that they proceed, henceforth, in the settlement of parishes, according to the practice which

prevailed previously to the passing of that act; keeping especially in view the undoubted privilege of parishioners to state, at the moderation of the call, any relevant objections to the induction of presentees; upon which, presbyteries, after hearing parties, shall decide;—it being in the power of these parties to appeal, if they see cause, to the superior church courts.’ ”

This motion embodied the opinion of that party in the church, which had long been predominant, and which had for nearly a century supported the claims of patrons in opposition to the right of the people to choose their own pastors. This party, however, had now ceased, for several years, to be a majority in the General Assembly; yet they continued to maintain their former principles and policy. They had of course opposed the veto act in all its stages; and now was a favorable opportunity to have it repealed or nullified.

The motion submitted to the Assembly, by Dr. Chalmers, was in the words following, viz: “The General Assembly having heard the report of the procurator on the Auchterarder case, and considered the judgment of the House of Lords, affirming the decision of the court of sessions, and being satisfied that by the said judgment, all questions of civil right, so far as the presbytery of Auchterarder is concerned, are substantially decided, in accordance with the uniform practice of this church, and with the resolution of the General Assembly, ever to give and inculcate obedience to the decisions of civil courts, in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by the law to the church, instruct the said presbytery to offer no further resistance to the claims of Mr. Young or the patron, to the emoluments of the benefice of Auchterarder, and refrain from claiming the *jus devolutum*, or any other civil right or privilege connected with said benefice.

“And whereas the principle of non-intrusion is one coeval with the Reformed Church of Scotland, and forms an integral part of its constitution, embodied in its standards, and declared in various acts of Assembly, the General Assembly resolve that the principle cannot be abandoned, and that no presentee shall be forced upon any parish, contrary to the will of the congregation.

“And whereas, by the decision above referred to, it appears that when this principle is carried into effect, in any parish, the legal provision for the sustentation of the ministry in that parish may be thereby suspended, the General Assembly, deeply

impressed with the unhappy consequences which must arise from any collision between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and holding it to be their duty to use every means in their power, not involving any dereliction of the principles and fundamental laws of their constitution, to prevent such unfortunate results, do therefore appoint a committee for the purpose of considering in what way the privileges of the national establishment, and the harmony between church and state, may remain unimpaired, with instructions to confer with the government of the country if they see cause."

In this motion of Dr. Chalmers, there is much evidence of wisdom, moderation, and firmness. He concedes every thing which the civil courts have any right to claim, but in regard to the principle of the right of the people, and of the church, he takes a firm stand, and declares that this ground cannot be abandoned. But dreading a collision with the civil authorities, he proposes the appointment of a committee to enquire what could be done to prevent an evil so much to be deprecated.

Dr. Muir, not being satisfied with either of these motions, offered a third. It would seem, that although not opposed in sentiment to the *veto act*, yet he was not willing to take ground which would bring the church into collision with the state; but was disposed to succumb to the decision of the court of session, as confirmed by the House of Lords. He wished, however, that it should be left to presbyteries to determine whether a candidate was a suitable minister for the people, over whom he was about to be placed. As we understand the motion, Dr. Muir was willing to waive the principle, that the consent of a majority of the people should be necessary; provided the presbytery, after due examination, were satisfied of the fitness of the candidate. But the reader may judge for himself respecting the true intention of this motion; it is as follows: "That the Church, more effectually to accomplish *that* which has ever been the design of her enactments relative to the calling and inducting of ministers—viz, the receiving for vacant parishes of persons not only irreproachable in moral character, sound in doctrine, and of adequate learning, but also suited to the parishes to which they are nominated,—did pass the act on calls, commonly called the *Veto act*. 2. That in passing this act of her own will, and carrying it into effect, the church was influenced by the belief, that this act being, not only in its nature, but also in its consequences, strictly and purely spiritual, there

was no necessity to obtain previously, the concurrence of the legislature to it. 3. That the decision of the supreme civil tribunal, in the recent case of Auchterarder, has determined that the consequences of this act do infringe on civil and patrimonial rights; and that hence it is ascertained to have been incompetent to the General Assembly to enforce the said enactment, without first having obtained the sanction of the Legislature. 4. That the church, however, while giving and inculcating implicit obedience to the decisions of the civil courts, in all matters relating to a civil right, ought not to forego the steady prosecution of her own high purpose of securing, more effectually, the appointment of ministers, not only sound in doctrine and morals, but also suitable to the parishes to which they are nominated. 5. That the suitability of presentees for the parishes to which they are nominated, and all circumstances and considerations for ascertaining *that* suitability in each particular case, whether as to the situation or mind of the people, or as to the special qualifications of the presentees themselves, ought to become the subjects of investigation and judgment to presbyteries, in the discharge of their solemn duty in filling up vacancies, as well as the usual and general qualifications in candidates for the sacred ministry. 6. That a committee be appointed to consider and to report as to the plan which may be best calculated for attaining this important end, and whereby, consistently with the acknowledgment and enforcement of such civil rights as are recognised by the law of the land, the spiritual interests of the Christian people, the judicial character and privileges of the ecclesiastical courts, and the professional character and usefulness of probationers may be effectually maintained, and the union between church and state be preserved entire."

When the several motions were laid on the table, Dr. Cook's being first in order, he stated his views at full length; and in conclusion, said that he was willing to add to his motion, (as he did before the vote was taken,) these words, "As also that in terms of the declaration of the General Assembly, at Edinburg, on the 29th of August, 1639, as interpreted by the concluding act of the General Assembly of St. Andrews, on the 2d August, 1642, all ministers or entrants presented to kirks, be tried before their admission, if they be qualified for the places to which they are presented, besides the ordinary trials of expectants, before their entrance to the ministry."

Dr. Chalmers followed Dr. Cook in a very long and able speech, at the close of which he proposed the motion already cited. Here it may be proper to inform our readers, not already acquainted with the fact, that in the debates of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the same order is not observed as in our General Assembly, and other deliberative bodies in this country, in which but one motion can be before the body at one time. In the Scotch Assembly, on all important questions, there is a motion and a counter motion before the body at one and the same time. Dr. Cook's and Dr. Chalmers' motions were both discussed at once. And, indeed, Dr. Muir's was also discussed with the others. The debate was long, able, and animated. And when the first vote was taken, for what reason does not appear, it was between the motion of Dr. Chalmers and that of Dr. Muir, when there appeared a majority in favour of Dr. Chalmers' over Dr. Muir's of 36, and on the second vote, a majority over Dr. Cook's of 47. At the time of the vote, Dr. Chalmers was not in the house.

A great many members entered their dissent against the decision of the Assembly, and Dr. Cook declared his intention not to serve on the committee to be raised under Dr. Chalmers' motion, and the Earl of Dalhousie, in declaring a similar intention, took occasion to state, in consequence of the resolution the house had come to, that he would withdraw altogether from the General Assembly. At the conclusion of his speech, accordingly, the noble lord immediately left the house.

The committee, as named by Dr. Chalmers, were, the Moderator, Dr. Muir, Mr. Candlish, Dr. Gordon, Alexander E. Monteith, Esq., J. Maitland Hogg, Esq., Dr. Makellar, J. Hope Johnstone, Esq., Sir C. D. Ferguson, Bart., James Smith, Esq., Dr. Smith, the Lord Provost of Glasgow, Principal M'Farlan, Robert Bruce, Esq., Lieut. Col. Dundas, Claud Alexander, Esq., Dr. Cook, Principal Dewar, Mr. Robertson of Ellon, J. C. Brodie, Esq., G. Buchan, Esq., Alexander Dunlop, Esq.

Principal M'Farlan, Dr. Cook, Mr. Robertson, and Sir Charles D. Ferguson requested their names to be withdrawn from the committee. The committee was then completed by the addition of Dr. Chalmers, the Procurator, J. Stewart, Esq., and with power to add to their number.

When this case was before the House of Lords, it was

argued in favour of the decision of the court of session, and against the church, by Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham, former Chancellors of England.

Among the speeches delivered in the General Assembly, none that we have seen, is, in point of clearness and force of argument, at all equal to that of Alexander E. Monteith, Esq. He supported Dr. Chalmers' motion. In speaking of the probable consequences of taking this ground, he admits that the church would materially suffer in her temporal interests; then he goes on to say, "At the same time, sir, there may be evils to the church greater than the loss of a part, or even the whole of her temporalities. I presume there is no member of this House who will venture to avow the opinion, that it would not be an infinitely greater evil for her to abandon those spiritual rights and privileges, which are essential to her character as a Christian church, without which she must be degraded from being an instrument of spiritual usefulness to the people, into being a mere political engine of the state, without which she might indeed continue to subserve the purpose of a preventive police, (which some parts of the argument of the reverend doctor opposite would lead us to think that he regarded as her most important function,) but could not for a single moment aspire to the dignity or sacred character of a church of Christ. That this must be the result of submitting her spiritual functions to the control of the civil courts, is what no man who understands the first principles of a Christian church, can gainsay or deny; but what is of greater importance to the question before the House, no man who attends to the principles on which the Church of Scotland is established, and to the jurisdiction which is vested in her courts by the statute law of the realm, can doubt, that it never was the intention of the legislature to establish a system involving elements so subversive of the true ends and objects of a Christian church, as those which are involved in the proposition, that her proceedings in matters purely spiritual, are to be subjected to the jurisdiction of the civil courts."

Dr. Cook and his friends, in support of his motion, had pathetically represented the unhappy consequences of a collision between the church and state, which they predicted would be the consequence of adopting Dr. Chalmers' motion. In reply to this Mr. Monteith says, "I deny that the church, in this matter, stands opposed to the state. I deny that there is any collision between the church and the state. The col-

lision, if there is one, is between the civil and ecclesiastical courts, between the church courts and the court of session, each of which equally derives its authority from the state, and which authority, in so far as it is vested in them respectively, by the constitution, each of them is bound, in the discharge of its duty to that constitution, to maintain and uphold. It may be, that in the discharge of that duty, they may take different views of the same matter, or of the extent of their respective jurisdictions, and that, in consequence, the judgments pronounced by them may be in conflict with each other. But this is no more than happens frequently, as every lawyer will tell you, between courts of co-ordinate jurisdiction, without its ever being dreamt of, that the one court, in vindicating its inherent jurisdiction against the encroachments of the other, is placing itself in an attitude of opposition to the law, or as my learned friend would express it, an attitude of collision to the state. In like manner, sir, it may be true that the judgments pronounced in one court, may indirectly affect rights that fall under the proper and exclusive jurisdiction of another court of co-ordinate jurisdiction, but every one, in the least degree conversant with such subjects, knows that this is a matter of frequent occurrence, without involving any such consequence, as that the one is bound to submit to the control of the other, within its own peculiar province, is under the sanction of being implicated in a charge of opposition to civil authority.

“My reverend friend, (Dr. Cook,) has assumed that the court of session is supreme in Scotland. I admit that it is supreme in matters of civil jurisdiction, but I deny that it is supreme in the sense which the reverend doctor’s argument involves. The constitution of Scotland recognizes several courts, all of which are supreme in their own departments, and none of which has any jurisdiction over the others. It recognizes the court of session as supreme in civil matters, subject always to appeal to the House of Lords, which, while sitting judicially in Scotch cases, is truly the supreme civil court of Scotland. But the court of session is not the only supreme court recognized by the constitution. It equally recognizes the court of justiciary, as supreme in criminal matters, the court of exchequer, as supreme in fiscal matters, and the courts of the established church, as supreme in spiritual matters. Each of these courts is supreme in its own peculiar province, and is not subject directly or indirectly to the control or jurisdiction of either of the others.

It frequently happens in practice, that these courts pronounce judgments which are inconsistent with, and contrary to those of another. But the remedy does not lie in the appeal from one of these courts to the other, but in each holding on in its own cause, to the effect of explicating the peculiar jurisdiction with which it is invested, irrespective of the judgments and decrees of the other.

“From the reverend doctor’s expression of surprise, this doctrine appears to be new to him. I scarcely think it can be so in reality. It is a point of law beyond the reach of dispute, and one which I am quite sure that none of my learned friends on the opposite side of the house, will venture to contest.

“For the sake of those who are not so conversant with these matters, I would illustrate the proposition by a simple case. A party brings an action in the court of session, to claim a legacy, on the faith of an alleged will, and the opposite party refuses to pay the legacy, on the ground that the will is not a genuine document, but a forgery, committed by the claimant. In order to determine the court point as to the legacy, the court must try the question of forgery. Suppose the court to pronounce a judgment, sustaining the deed as genuine, and virtually finding the prisoner not guilty of the forgery, and to adjudge the legacy to be paid accordingly. Notwithstanding such a judgment of the court of session, it would be perfectly competent for the public prosecutor to indict the same individual for forgery in the court of justiciary, and for the court of justiciary, if satisfied that he was guilty, to pronounce sentence of transportation, and, it may be, of death against him. Here then is a distinct contradiction between the judgments of those two courts. The one orders a legacy to be paid, on the ground of a deed being genuine, to an individual whom the other condemns to death, for having forged that very deed; and what is the consequence? Was it ever heard of that the court of session arrogated to itself the right to declare that the court of justiciary had done wrong? Or that the court of justiciary arrogated a right to declare that the court of session had done wrong? No lawyer will maintain such a proposition. And why? Simply because the one court is not subordinate to the other. No appeal lies from the one to the other. They are courts of co-ordinate jurisdiction. Suppose that the court of session were to intersect the court of justiciary from trying the accused, on the ground that they

had pronounced a judgment which virtually found him to be not guilty, would the court of justiciary regard the interdict? Unquestionably not. They would say, and say correctly, that whatever the court of session might do in regard to the civil rights of parties, the constitution had entrusted them, as the supreme criminal court of the country, with the administration of criminal justice, with which the court of session had nothing to do. The same would hold in the converse case of an attempt, on the part of the court of justiciary, to interfere with the jurisdiction of the court of session. The court of session would say, and say correctly, that the court of justiciary had nothing to do with questions of civil right; that the court of session was supreme in all such matters; that they were bound to exercise their own judgment; to explicate their own jurisdiction, with regard to the judgment of the court of justiciary. What then, it may be asked, would be the result of this? It is clear that both judgments, as to the matter of fact, cannot be right, because by the supposition the one is directly contrary to the other. If neither court is to control the other, who is to decide between them? I say, sir, without the risk of being contradicted by any lawyer in this house, that there is no court to decide between them, and yet that neither of them is bound to defer to the other. Each court is supreme, and it is presumed by the constitution, that the judgment of each is right. The result therefore is, that both judgments stand good, and will be given effect to—the judgment of the civil court to the effect of settling the civil rights that may be affected by the deed, and the court of justiciary to the effect of all penal consequences. In short, sir, I maintain, without the risk of contradiction, that in the case of courts co-ordinate, the principle of law, in case of conflicting judgments, is, that each proceeds to put in execution its own judgment, without regard to any judgment which may have been pronounced by the other. Nor does it in the least degree affect the matter, that the judgment in the one court may, in its consequences, affect the rights of the same, or some third person, which fall primarily under the jurisdiction of another court. It may happen, for example, that a sentence pronounced by the court of justiciary may materially affect the civil and patrimonial rights of either the individual who is the subject of the sentence, or of third parties, but no such collateral or incidental effect of a judgment not pronounced in the exercise of its lawful jurisdiction could give the civil court any right to control or interfere with it.

“Sir, if these principles are admitted, it humbly appears to me that they are conclusive of the question before the house. A conflict between the civil and spiritual courts is to be regulated by the same principles as a conflict between the civil and criminal courts. The analogy is perfect, and the inference irresistible, if they are courts of co-ordinate jurisdiction. That they are so must be admitted, if I can show that the constitution has invested the church courts with an exclusive jurisdiction in matters spiritual, and that the judgment in the Auchterarder case, refusing to induct Mr. Young, was pronounced in the exercise of that jurisdiction. But it is impossible to dispute either of these propositions. It is impossible to deny, that the constitution has entrusted the church courts with a final and exclusive jurisdiction in spiritual matters, and it seems equally impossible to deny that the ordination and induction of a minister is a spiritual matter. It does seem strange, sir, that any man should be called upon in our day, and in this General Assembly of the church of Scotland, for authority in support of either of their propositions, which have been received for three centuries, as axioms in our constitution. But so it is, and fortunately it is no difficult task to comply with the demand.”

The learned gentleman then proceeds to cite authorities from the statutes, but the above will serve as a specimen of the whole speech, which is luminous and conclusive in every part.

Dr. Chalmers could not but feel deeply interested in this cause, as through his motion and influence the *veto act* was adopted. And his concern was no doubt increased by the apprehension, that from the course pursued by the civil court, something disastrous might happen to the religious establishment of Scotland, which he conceives to be of vital importance to the church.

In his speech, already referred to, on occasion of offering his motion, he first states the part which he had taken six years before, in getting the *veto act* passed; speaks feelingly of the difficulty of the attitude into which the church was brought, by the confirmation of the decision of the court of session by the house of lords; but intimates, that he thought he could see an outlet to these perplexities. He mentions, that the views which he now entertained respecting the rights of patrons and of the people, had been familiar to his mind from the year 1819; and even three years before, he had proclaimed the same doctrine in the General Assembly, when the

two leaders Dr. Hill, and Dr. Nicol, lifted up their hands in astonishment, and declared, that for half a century, no such opinion had been heard within the walls of the supreme ecclesiastical court. He says, however, that at the time, his plan was not immediately to meddle with the relations between the patrons and parishes, but to go directly to parliament, and endeavour to obtain the passage of a law which would place this matter on its just foundation, and if this course which he then advocated, had been pursued, the church would have been saved from the unhappy collision with the civil courts which had taken place. "But," says he, "let it be distinctly understood, that when I recommended this, it was not for the purpose of obtaining the sanction of the state in favour of our own great constitutional principle of non-intrusion, for that I hold to be beyond their province;—neither for the purpose of superadding the civil and ecclesiastical sanction, in order to confer a rightful authority either on the veto law, or any other decrees by which to carry the principle of non-intrusion into effect; for that I hold to be equally beyond their province; but for the purpose of making sure that we did not forget that which it is altogether within the power and province of a government either to give or withhold the inestimable benefit of a national establishment—of making sure that we did not dissever the temporalities from the living, a consequence fraught with disaster to the moral and religious interests of the people of Scotland. That was the only principle on which I can vindicate the advice then given; and my only regret is, that it was not taken. I now regret with all my heart, that my fears were overruled by the high legal authority of those whom I felt to be greatly more competent than myself for a judgment, on the effects of the step which was actually resolved upon. But better late than never. The very measure which I had advised, and which if consented to, would have prevented the blunder, I now advise over again, and that for the purpose of repairing it." He next attempts to remove the prejudice imbibed by the higher classes, both in England and Scotland, that this proceeding of the church was of a *radical* and rebellious character. He solemnly assures these classes, that this was not the fact; and declares, that there was not the slightest affinity between "the honest demand of the common people for a pure gospel, and those demands which are lifted up in the loud accents of turbulence and menace for the extension of their rights as citi-

zens. "There is," says he, "a total distinction and dissimilarity between these two things. Even an anti-patronage clergyman, let alone a vetoist, is just as unlike a chartist, or a radical, as William Wilberforce is unlike to William Cobbett."

The speaker next enters into an explanation of the nature of that dependence which the church has on the state; and deprecates the idea, that this subject has any thing to do with politics. Speaking still of the upper classes, whose prejudices he was labouring to obviate, he says, "They will find, in truth, that we have no politics at all, or rather no other than the safe, and the pacific, and the healthy politics of the New Testament—a code made up of five articles, the first of which is 'to fear God'—the second, 'to honour the king'—the third, 'to obey magistrates'—the fourth, 'meddle not with them that are given to change'—and the fifth, 'lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.'"

Dr. Chalmers makes it a special object, in his speech, to discourage a spirit of defiance towards the civil power, which some, under present circumstances, might be disposed to indulge. Indeed, his whole speech is of the most pacific and conciliatory character; but he nowhere manifests the least disposition to concede, in any degree, the principle asserted as belonging to the church in the Veto Act. So far from this, he defends the rights of the church and people in spiritual matters, with a power of reasoning which cannot be resisted; and happily elucidates the nature of the existing alliance between the church of Scotland and the civil government.

The latter part of this able speech is occupied with an examination of the opinions laid down, in the speeches of Lord Brougham, and the chancellor, before the House of Lords. And here he shows that these men, so learned in the law, were entirely mistaken in their views, both of the facts and law, as it related to the church of Scotland. He also answers the arguments of the Dean of Faculty, before the court of session.

Dr. Chalmers takes special pains to answer the objection derived from the appeal by the church to the House of Lords, involving an acknowledgment of the right of that court to divide the question. This he accomplishes in a very masterly manner. He also vindicates with much ability, the propriety of allowing the people a voice in the selection of

their own pastors. The Dean of Faculty had sneered at this proposition: but Dr. Chalmers defends it with conclusive arguments. "Now if there be one thing," says he, "of which we are more confident than another, it is, that here we have all philosophy on one side, and all that is sound in the experience of human nature. Not in Christianity alone, but in a thousand other subjects of human thought, there may be antipathies and approvals, resting on a most solid and legitimate foundation—not properly without reasons, but reasons deeply felt, yet incapable of being adequately communicated. And if there be one topic more than another, on which this phenomenon of the human spirit should be most frequently realized, it is the topic of Christianity—a religion, the manifestation of whose truth is unto the conscience; and the response, or assenting testimony to which, is an object of instant discernment, might issue from the deep recesses of their moral nature, on the part of whom, it is a felt reality—able therefore to articulate their belief, yet not able to articulate the reasons of it. There is much, and that the weightiest part by far, of the internal evidence for Christianity, that rests on the adaptations which obtain between its objective truths, and the felt necessities or desires of our subjective nature—adaptations powerfully and intimately felt by many a possessor of that nature, who is yet unable to propound them in language, far less to state and moderate them at the bar of judgment. And if the prerogatives of the human conscience were at one time more cruelly trampled upon than at another, it has been within the last century, and at the bar of this house,—when the collective mind of a congregation, who both knew and loved the truth as it is in Jesus, has been contemptuously set at naught, and the best, the holiest feelings of our Scottish patriarchs, by lordly oppressors sitting in judgment over them, were barbarously scorned. In that age of violent settlements, these simple, these unlettered men of a rustic congregation, would say no more, yet said truly of the intruded minister, that he did not preach the gospel, and that in the doctrine he gave, there was no food for the nourishment of their souls. I cannot imagine a more painful spectacle, than such men as these, the worthies of the olden time, at once the pride and preserving salt of our Scottish commonwealth, placed under the treatment and rough handling of an able, jeering, ungodly advocate, while coarse, and contemptuous clergymen, booted and spurred for riding

committees,* were looking on and enjoying the scene; and a loud laugh from the seats of their assembled scorers, completed the triumph over the religious sensibilities of men, who could but reclaim with their hearts, and not with their voices. This was the policy of Dr. Robertson, recently lauded in high places,† a policy which has dissevered our population from our church, and shed most withering influence over the religion of the families of Scotland. Re-enact this policy if you will, and you place your kirk as a national establishment, on the brink of its sure annihilation. Have a care, ye professing friends of order and loyalty, have a care, lest by a departure from the line of resolute and unswerving principle, you strip the church of all moral weight in the eyes of the community. Think of the deadly enemies by whom we are surrounded, and have a care, lest by one hair-breadth of deviation from the path of integrity and honour, you cause the hearts of these Philistines to rejoice."

If it had been our object to present the arguments and authorities, which have been abundantly brought forward, on both sides of this case, we should have made large extracts from the learned pamphlet of the Rev. Andrew Gray, which is the first prefixed to this review; but our design was merely to exhibit to our readers a fair view of the nature of the case, and the proceedings of the civil and ecclesiastical courts in relation to it; for although frequently paragraphs have appeared in our papers on the subject, yet we are of opinion, that few persons in this country have understood the true nature of the difficulty which has arisen between the church and state in Scotland.

The speeches of the Rev. D. Burns, of Paisley, and of the Rev. Mr. Candlish, of St. George's, Edinburgh, are animated, eloquent discourses, but we have not room to analyze them, nor is it necessary to our purpose, which was nothing more than to give a doctrinal and comprehensive view of this interesting case, the materials for which have been sufficiently supplied from the speeches of the eminent men already brought under review.

* "Booted and spurred for riding committees." This relates to the committees of clergymen appointed by the General Assembly to ordain presentees, when the presbyteries of the place refused to do it.

† This relates to Lord Brougham's eulogy on Dr. Robertson, in the House of Lords. Dr. Robertson was the relative and patron of Brougham.

ART. V.—*A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language, containing the Accentuation—the Grammatical Inflections—the irregular words referred to their themes—the parallel terms from the other Gothic languages—the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon in English and Latin,—and copious English and Latin Indexes, serving as a Dictionary of English and Anglo-Saxon, as well as of Latin and Anglo-Saxon. With a Preface on the Origin and Connexion of the Germanic tongues—a Map of Languages, and the Essentials of Anglo-Saxon Grammar.* By the Rev. J. Bosworth, L. L. D. Dr. Phil. Leyden; B. D. of Trinity College, Cambridge, &c. &c. British Chaplain at Rotterdam. Royal 8vo. London, 1838. pp. 923.

WE give the whole of the copious title, as the most compendious way of indicating the contents of this valuable work; which must certainly be considered as marking a great advance in this walk of antiquarian philology. The study of the Anglo-Saxon tongue is yet in its infancy in America; and even in Great Britain, to the shame of its learned men, there has been so little use made of their facilities in this kind, that the most important researches have been ingloriously resigned to continental scholars: for it is scarcely needful to say, that there has been no Englishman, since the days of Junius, even if he is an exception, who can come into competition with Grimm and Rask.

There is one reason for this, however, which may serve as a partial apology. It is on the continent that the great boughs of the Teutonic tree still exist, while in England we have a scion cut away from the parent trunk, and deformed by numerous grafts from other stocks. Whatever may be thought of this, it will be apparent to every student, that the chief modern authorities, in this branch of comparative philology, are of the German and Scandinavian nations. It is from such sources that Dr. Bosworth has deduced some of his most useful matter, and by means of his seemingly familiar acquaintance with all the languages of which he speaks, he has produced a volume, which, though costly, is in our opinion a treasury of information to any one who would search into the wealth of the English tongue. The Preface alone, which fills more than two hundred pages, is fraught with the general and comparative literature of the Anglo-Saxon and its allied tongues, and with an amount of critical and bibliographical

learning, which, so far as we know, cannot be matched in any book in the English language. The author treats first of the importance of ethnography and comparative grammar, and endeavours to trace the affinities of language in their various ramifications. He then proceeds to consider the Germanic and Scandinavian languages, and the division into High and Low German. He dwells at length upon the Anglo-Saxon, and its sister tongue, the Friesic, concerning which he gives a rich and ingenious dissertation, from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Halbertsma, himself a Friesian, and 'enthusiastically devoted to the honour of his country, and his vernacular dialect. The same course is pursued, with regard to the Old Saxons, the Hollanders, the Goths, the Alemanni or Suabians, the Franks, and the Scandinavians. These dissertations, for they are chiefly such, are valuable for the great number of specimens of all the languages and dialects which are mentioned; many of these being derived from rare books and manuscripts, which are altogether beyond the reach of the recluse scholar.

From the preliminary account of the Anglo-Saxon language, and of the manner in which it grew into the present English, we purpose to be large borrowers. There is no subject of greater interest to one who loves his mother-tongue, and there are few concerning which gross ignorance and extreme error are more rife. It has become very common for writers, who ought to know better, to speak concerning our language, about Saxon and Anglo-Saxon, in terms which plainly show that they are aware of no difference between the two, or between either and the English tongue. Before adducing any of Dr. Bosworth's facts, we distinctly acknowledge the extent of our obligation, especially as, wherever it is convenient, we shall use his very words.

The Anglo-Saxons are derived from the Angles, a tribe of the Saxon confederacy, occupying Anglen, in the south-east part of the duchy of Sleswig, in the south of Denmark. Their origin was oriental, but as they were as far westward as the Elbe, in the year 90, they were probably among the first of the Germanic tribes that visited Europe. By gradual increase, the Saxons came to possess the country within the Elbe, the Sala, and the Rhine, in addition to their former territory between the Elbe and the Eyder.

The principal tribes which entered Britain were the Jutes, the Saxons, and the Angles. Of these the Jutes came first. Hengist and Horsa, two brothers from Jutland, arrived in three small ships in A. D. 449. For assisting the Britons

against the Picts, they had the Isle of Thanet assigned to them: they afterwards gained the Isle of Wight, Kent, and part of Hampshire. After the Jutes, must be mentioned the Saxons, who were called *Old Saxons*, to distinguish them from their kinsmen in Britain. The first Saxon kingdom was established by Ella, in A. D. 491, under the name of South-Saxons, or South-Sax, now Sussex. Another colony, under Cerdic, arrived in 519. These were the West-Saxons, (West-Seaxe,) occupying, at their widest extent, the north of Hampshire, Berks, Wilts, Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and part of Cornwall. A third kingdom, in A. D. 527, was planted in Essex, Middlesex, and the south of Hertfordshire, under the name of East-Sax, or Essex. But besides the Jutes and the Saxons, were the Angles, as mentioned above. In A. D. 527, they settled themselves in East Anglia, containing Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, and part of Bedfordshire. The other Angle kingdoms were Bernicia, Deira, and Mercia, established in 547, 559, and 586, respectively. Thus, one Jute, three Saxon, and four Angle, altogether eight kingdoms, were established in Britain, by the year 586. "This state of Britain," says Turner in his History of the Anglo-Saxons, "has been improperly denominated the Saxon heptarchy. When all the kingdoms were settled, they formed an octarchy."

The Angles emigrated in a mass, so as to leave their original country uninhabited; they were accompanied by many of the Friesians. The term Anglo-Saxon denotes that the people so called, were the Angles, a nation coming from the Saxon confederacy. The country of their settlement came to be called Engla-land, or the Angles' land, now England.

Upon the full establishment of the Saxon tribes, the Britons were driven into Wales, and the Saxons began to contend among themselves. The West-Saxons gradually gained upon the others, till A. D. 327, when Egbert, King of Wessex, defeated, or made tributary all the other kingdoms. He and his successors had to contend with the Northmen, or Danes. The most successful of these kings was Alfred the Great, who drove out the Northmen. The literary turn of Alfred is well known. He translated into Anglo-Saxon, Boethius, Orosius, and Bede, and thus gave a pre-eminence to the West-Saxon language. There was a change of dynasty in A. D. 1016, when Canute, the Dane, came to the throne. The Saxon line was restored in 1042, and continued till the Norman conquest in 1066. But the Anglo-Saxon language

continued to be spoken till the time of Henry III. A. D. 1258. Dr. Bosworth thinks that what was written after this date may fairly be called English.

From this statement it will appear, that it was Alfred's patronage of the West-Saxon, which erected it into the court dialect, and basis of our speech. This is the pure Anglo-Saxon, and is found in the works of Alfred, Ælfric, the Anglo-Saxon laws, Cædmon, &c.

As a specimen, of easy comparison, we give the following from the parable of the Sower, in Marshall's Gospels:

Mk. iv. 3—8.

3. Gehyrath, Ute eode se sædere hys sæd to sawenne.
4. And tha he sew, sum feoll with thone weg, and fugelas comon and hyt fræton. 5. Sum feoll ofer stanscyligean, tha hyt næfde mycel eorthan, and sona up-eode, fortham the hyt næfde eorthan thicnesse. 6. Tha hyt up-eode, seo sunne hyt forswælde, and hyt forscrane, fortham hyt wirtruman næfde. 7. And sum feoll on thornas, tha stigon tha thornas and forthrysmodon thæt, and hyt wæstm ne bær. 8. And sum feoll on god land, and hyt sealde, upstigende and wexende, wæstm, and an brohte thrittig-fealdne, sum syxtigfealdne, sum hundfealdne.

It is probable that the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons, were not without some differences of dialect when they arrived. But the Jutes were few in number, and the influence of their language must have been small. The dialect of the Angles, which was formerly called the Dano-Saxon dialect, was harsher and harder than the West-Saxon. Specimens of these several dialects are given in the work before us. Instead of these, however, we will introduce specimens of the Lord's Prayer, from the Mithridates of Adelung:

1. Anglo-Saxon of King Alfred, A. D. 875.

“Fæder ure, thu the earth on Heofenum,
Si thin Nama gehalgod;
To be cume thin Rice;
Gewurthe thin Willa on Eorthan swa swa on Heofnum;
Urne ge dāghwanlican Hlaf syle us to dāg;
And forgyf us ure Gyltas, swa swa we forgyfath urum Gyltendum;
And ne gelādde thu us on Costnung;
Ac alyse us of Yfle.”

2. Dano-Saxon, of Aldred, A. D. 880.

“Fader uren, thu arth in Heofnum,
Si gehalgud Noma thin;
To cymeth Ric thin;
Sie Willo thin suae is in Heofne and in Eortha;
Hlaf usenne of wistlic sel us to Dæg;
And fergef us Scylda usna, suā ue fergefon Scyldgum usum;
And ne inlād usih in Costunge;
Uh gefrig usich from Yfle.”

3. Probably the same in a different dialect.

“Uren Fader thie arth in Heofnas,
Sie gehalgud thin Noma;
To cymeth thin Ryc;
Sie thin Willa sue is in Heofnas, and in Eortha;
Uren Hlaf ofer wittlic sel us to Dæg;
And forgef us Scylda urna, sue we forgefan Scyldgum urum;
And no inlād usih in Custnung;
Ah gefrig usih from Ifle.”

4. Dano-Saxon, of A. D. 900.

“Thu ure Fäder, the eart on Heofenum,
Si thin Nama gehalgod;
Cume thin Rice;
Si thin Willa on Eortha, swa swa on Heofonum;
Syle us to Dæg urne dāghwanlican Hlaf;
And forgif us ure Gyltas, swa swa we forgifath tham the
with us agyltath;
And ne lād thu na us on Costnunge;
Ac alys us fram Yfele. Sih it swa.”

5. Probably of the same date.

“Fäder ure, thu the in Heofonum,
Beo gehalgud thin Noma;
Cume to thine Rice;
Weorthe thin Willa swa swa on Hoefune, swile on Eorthe;
Hlaf userne dāghwamlicu sel us so Dæg;
And forlete us ure Scylde, swa swa we ec forleten thām the
scyldigat with us;
And ne gelāt us geleade in Costnungä;
Ah gelese us of Yfle.”

6. Dano-Saxon, from Marshall's Gospels.

“Fäder ure, thu the eart on Heofenum,
Si thin Nama gehalgod;

To-becume thin Rice;
 Gewurthe thin Willa on Eorthan swa swa on Heofenum;
 Urne daghwamlican Hlaf syle us to Dæg;
 And forgyf us ure Gyltas, swa swa we forgyfath urum Gyl-
 tendum;
 And ne gelädde thu us on Costnunge;
 Ac alys us of Yfele. Sothlike."

7. Anglo-Saxon or English of 1160.

"Ure Fäder, thu the on Heofene eart,
 Syo thin Name gohaleged;
 To cume thin Rice;
 Geworde thin Wille on Heofene and on Eorthe;
 Syle us to Daig urne daighwamliche Hlaf;
 And forgyf us ure Geltes, swa we forgyfath aelcen thare the
 with us agylteth;
 And ne läd thu us on Costnunge;
 Ac alys us fram Yfele."

8. English of the 13th century.

"Oure Fader, that art in Hevenes,
 Halewid be thi Name;
 Thy Kingdom come;
 To be thi Wille do as in Hevene and in Erthe;
 Gyff to us this Day oure Brede over other Substance;
 And forgyve to us our Dettis, as forgyven to oure Dettours;
 And lede us not into Temptatioun;
 But delyve us fro Yvel. Amen, that is, so beit."

9. English of 1370.

"Our Fadyr, that art in Hevenes,
 Halloed be thy Name;
 Thy Kingdom come to;
 Be thy Will done in Ertne as in Hevene;
 Geve to us this Day our Bread, over other Substance;
 And forgif to us our Dettis, as we forgyven to our Detters;
 And leed us not into Temptation;
 But deliver us from Evil. Amen."

10. English of 1430.

"Oure Fadir, that art in Hevenes,
 Halewid be thi Name;
 Thi Kingdom come to thee;
 Be thi Will don in Eerthe as in Hevene;
 Give to us this Day oure Breed over othre Substance;

And forgive to us oure Dettis, as we forgiven oure Dettours;
And lede us not into Temptation;
But deliver us from Ivel. Amen.”

11. English of Tindal’s Version, 1526.

“Our Father, which art in Heven,
Halowed be thy Name;
Let thy Kingdom come;
Thy Will be fullfilled as well in Earth, as it is in Heven;
Geve us this Daye our dayly Bred;
And forgeve as oure Dettis, as we forgiven oure Detters;
And leade us not into Temptation;
But deliver us from Evyll.
For thyne is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glorye
for ever.”

Dr. Bosworth thinks it evident that the pure West Saxon did not ever prevail over the whole of England, and that in process of time the language approached more or less to the present English according to its relative position to the West-Saxons. “The difference observable in the language of the most cultivated classes would be still more marked and apparent in the mass of population, or the less educated community. These, from their agricultural pursuits, had little communication with the inhabitants of other provinces; and having few opportunities and little inducement to leave their own neighbourhood, they intermarried among each other, and, from their limited acquaintance and circumscribed views, they would naturally be much attached to their old manners, customs, and language. The same cause operating from age to age would keep united the greater part of the population, or the families of the middle stations of life, it may therefore be well expected that much of the peculiarity of dialect prevailing in Anglo-Saxon times, is preserved even in the present day in the provincial dialects of the same districts. In these local dialects, then, remnants of the Anglo-Saxon tongue may be found in its least altered, most incorrupt, and therefore its purest state. Having a strong and expressive language of their own, they had little desire and few opportunities to adopt foreign idioms or pronunciation, and thus to corrupt the purity of their ancient language. Our present polished phrase and fashionable pronunciation are often new, and, as deviating from primitive usage, faulty and corrupt. We are therefore much indebted to those patriotic individuals, who have referred us to the archaisms of our nervous

language, by publishing provincial glossaries, and giving specimens of their dialects." No less than fourteen works of this kind are named by our author. From these much very interesting information might be derived, with regard to the variations of the English tongue. English travellers complain, no doubt, with some justice, of a tendency in American English to diverge from the original language, and to become a great provincial dialect. Yet this is nothing when compared with the dialects of England itself, in every part of which the lower class of people speak in a manner scarcely intelligible beyond their own region. The following specimen will illustrate this subject more fully than any abstract remarks: it is part of the same dialogue, given first in the Somerset and then in the Derbyshire dialect:

Somersetshire.

Farmer Bennet. Jan! why dwon't ye right my shoes?

Jan Lide. Bin, maester 'tis zaw cawld, I can't work wi' tha tacker at all; I've a brawk it ten times I'm shower to dâ—da vreeze za hord; an I can't avoord ta keep a good vier—I wish I cood—I'd zoon right your shoes an withers too—I'd zoon yarn zum money, I warnt ye. Can't ye vine zum work vor me, maester, theäze hord times—I'll do any theng ta sar a penny. I can drash—I can cleave brans—I can make spars—I can thatchy—I can shear ditch, an I can gripy too, bit da vreeze za hord. I can wimmy—I can messy or milky nif ther be need o't. I ood'n mine dreavin plough or any theng.

Farmer Bennet. I've a got nothin vor ye ta do, Jan; bit Mister Boord bane hond ta I jist now that thâ war gwain ta wimmy, and that thâ wanted zumbody ta help 'em.

Derbyshire.

Farmer Bennet. Tummus, why dunner yo mend mek shoon?

Tummus Lide. Becoz, mester, 'tis zo cood, I conner work wee the tachin at aw; I've brockn it ten times I'm shur to de—it freezes zo hard. I conner afford to keep a good fire—I wish I cud—I'd soon mend yore shoon, an uthers tow.—I'd soon yarn sum money, I warrant ye. Conner ye find some work for m', mester, these hard times?—I'll do onny think to addle a penny. I con thresh,—I con split wood—I con make spars—I con thack. I con skower a dike, and I con trench tow, bur it freeze zo hard. I con winner—I con

fother, or milk, if there be need on't. I woodner mind drivin plow, or onny think.

Farmer B. I hanner got nothin for ye to do, Tum-mus, bur Mester Boord tow'd me jist now that they wor goo-in to winner, an that they shud want somebody to help 'em.

Among these dialects we find the origin of many vulgar provincialisms in American pronunciation, particularly of such as characterize certain parts of New England. Thus in Norfolk we have *warnt* for were not, in Lancashire, *aw-lus* for always, *keaw* for cow, *heawse* for house. In the Exmoor dialect, *arter* for after; in Derbyshire *nation* for very, or very great, *summet* for somewhat.

Mr. Halbertsma, a native Friesian, gives the following remarkable testimony respecting the provincial dialects of his native tongue. "Among a people so fond of liberty as the Angles and Friesians, not only every district, but every village, nay every hamlet, must have a dialect of its own." "At this very time, those living on the coast of *Eastmahorn* in Friesland, do not understand the people of *Schiermonikoog*, a little island with one village of the same name, almost in sight of the coast." "It is now," Mr. H. continues, "sixteen years since I spoke to an old woman at *Molquerum*, a village now almost lying in ruins, but still divided into seven little islands, called *Pollen*, joined to each other by little bridges. Now the good woman told me in her homely style, that when she was a child, every island had its peculiar way of pronouncing, and that when an inhabitant of any of the villages entered her mother's house, she could ascertain to which *Pol* the person belonged, merely by some peculiarity of speech. Dependence may be placed on this fact, as I have ascertained its truth by strict inquiry."

As there is no country in the world more free from these inconveniences than our own, we shall add for the entertainment of our readers seventeen specimens of the following verse, in as many different German dialects: Math iv. 3. 4. *Hearken; behold there went out a Sower to sow; and it came pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way-side, and the fowls of the air came and devoured it up.*

1. *Luther's Bible, 1545.*

Höret zu! Sihe, es gieng ein Seeman aus zu seen. Vnd es begab sich, in dem er seet, fiel etlichs and den Weg, da kamen die Vogel unter dem Himel vnd frassens auff.

HIGH-GERMAN DIALECTS IN 1827.

2. *Canton Zurich.*

Losät uf, äs ischt en Ackhersma uffs Fäld gangä ge säen. Und da er gsät hät, ischt öbbis a d' Strass gfallä, da sind d' Vögel cho und händs ufgrässä.

3. *Canton Uri.*

Hört zuo, ksösch, a Man isscht ussganga go säia; und wie 'ne sait, falt'n öpis an die Strass, da sind die Vögel cho, und hand's aweg gefrassa.

4. *Suabian, near the Alps.*

Losat und luogad, as ischt a Sayer ussi ganga z'säud; und wie ear g'sait heat, ischt a Doal uf a Weag, g'fallä, den henn-da d' Vögel g'noh' und ufg'freassa.

5. *Alsacian, about Strasburg.*

Hert, siet der Ackersmann esch üssgange zu'm Saije; Un wie er g'saijit hätt, esch eins ouf de Waij g'falle; da sind d' Vögel komme ounterm Himmel, un häns ouffg'frässe.

6. *Salzburg.*

Hösch't's : Schau, ös gang a Samon aus zum San: Und ös gab si, indem a sat, völd a Doal an dem Wög, da kaman d' Vögl und frass'ns auf.

7. *Bavarian, about Munich.*

Lossts enk sogng! a Moi is a Baur aufs Sahn' naus ganga. Und wia r-a denn do g'saht hot, is e'am a Thoai Samma-r-ann Weg no gfoin; do sann d'Vögl vonn Himmi ro kemma, und hammatn aufg'frössn.

8. *Frankfort on Maine.*

Hihrt zou, Sich, es gung e Mol a Sihmann enausser z'sihn. Unn do hot sech's begäwwe, wa' er gesiht hot, fäil Epas d'rvun an'n Wäg: do senn di Vigol unnerm Hemmel kumme, unn hawwe's uffgefrosse.

9. *Hessian, about Kassel.*

Hehrt zu, sich, es gink en Sehmann us ze sehen. Un es begab sich, wie hä sehte, fiel etliches uf den Wäk; do kamen de Väggel unner dem Himmel und frassens uf.

10. *High-Saxon, about Leipsic.*

Hurt zu säht! 's gung ä mal a Siaemann aus zu Siaen. Un da hä siaete, da feel eeniges an'n Wäg: da kamen de Vogel ungern Himmel, un frassens uf.

11. *High-Saxon, about Ansbach.*

Härt zu! sieh, es gieng a Soama auf 's Soâ aus. Und es iss g'shegn, indemm ehr säte, fiel etlichs an den Weeg. Doa kamm die Viegel unt'rn Himmel und frassens auf.

LOW-GERMAN DIALECTS.

12. *Nienburg.*

Hört to : Seeth en Seyer günk ut to seyen. Un et begaf sick, unner't Seyen vull etlick an de Wech, do kemen de Vägels unner'n Himmel un fretent up.

13. *Platt-Deutsch, about Hanover.*

Härt tau, et gunk ein Sägemann ut, tau sägen. Und et begaf seck, weil hei sögte, fellen edliche Kören en den Weg; da keimen dei Vögeln under dem Himmel und fratten sei up.

14. *Platt-Deutsch of Brandenburg.*

Horch tau, et gink en Buer up't Feld tum Seen. Un et begap sick, indem he seete, föhl wat an der Side (oder: ob de Halve); da kamen de Vögel von Himmel (oder; von boben) und fratent up.

15. *Hamburg.*

Hör't to: Een Buhr güng ut sien Saat to sayn: As he nu say't, full een Deel von de Saat by den Wegg, un wurr von de Vägel unnern Himmel oppfreten.

16. *Brunswick.*

Höret tau! Süh et gung en Saiemann ut to saien, Un et begaf sik; bi den Saien, fell wat an den Weg; do kaimen de Vöggel under den Himmel un freiten et up.

17. *Mecklenburg-Schwerin.*

Hüret to: Sü, dar gink een Sajer uut, to sajen. Un et begav sik, as he sajete, feel week (wat) an de Straat, dar kemen de Vägel unner den Hewen, un freten't upp.

It will be evident upon even a cursory inspection of these specimens, which are culled from a much greater number, that the Low German is much nearer to the English than the other, and predominant dialect. This might be expected, as it is, with unimportant alterations, the Old Saxon tongue. The Low-German and Dutch proverbs are nearly all the same, both equally expressive, and in phraseology like the English.

As dat beer is in den man,
Is de wysheit in de kan.

As (*when*) the beer is in the man
The wisdom is in the can.

In the examples of Low-German given above, within the compass of two very short verses, we have the following English words, exactly, viz: *To, Up, Fell, Under, He, Side, By, Wurr* (were,) *As*; and the following nearly, viz: *Seeth*, see; *Weil*, while; *Weg*, way; *Horch*, hark; *Feld*, field; *Buer*, boor; *Boben*, above; *Ut*, out; *Hewen*, heaven; *Straat*, street; *Saat*, seed, &c.

The remarks of Mr. Halbertsma on this subject are valuable, for though he writes in English, and with great correctness, he possesses as a Hollander advantages for some parts of this comparison, such as have been enjoyed by few writers. "Low-Saxon," says he, "has all the appearance of German grafted on an Anglo-Friesic tree. The words are Anglo-Friesic, with German vowels, as if the Friesians, in adopting the German, retained the consonants of the old language. This observation may, with still greater propriety, be applied to the syntax and phraseology, that is, to the mental part or soul of the language. They continued to think in Anglo-Friesic forms, while their organs adopted the vowels and some other mechanical parts of the German. Hence there is scarcely a single expression or phrase extant in Anglo-Saxon, Friesic, or Dutch, of which the parallel may not be found in the Low-Saxon glossaries." According to the same authority, the proper Friesians, or those who are surrounded on the north, west, and south, by the Zuiderzee, continue to speak a dialect which is strikingly like the Anglo-Saxon. "I cannot omit to mention," he adds, "that the leaders of the Anglo-Saxons bear names which are now in use by the Friesians, though by time a little altered or abbreviated. They have *Hortse, Hengst, Witte, Wiggele, Eske, Tsjisse, Tsjerk, Ealse, Hessel*; for the Anglo-Saxon *Horsa, Hengest, Witta, Wihtgil*." There are indeed but few An-

glo-Saxon names which may not be found in use among the present Friesians.

But we must desist from minute observations of this kind, however strong the temptation, in order to accomplish what is the principal purpose of these remarks; for we have undertaken them in the hope of stimulating some of our younger philologists to the study of our own language in its remote sources. It is amusing to hear and read the remarks which often come under our notice, from persons who while their dialect abounds with every provincialism and vulgarism which is embalmed in Webster's indiscriminate collection, still prate about Saxon, and pure Saxon, as if they knew what the words meant. Separated by an ocean from the ancient seats of our vernacular tongue, and exposed to the breaking in of a mingled flood from other languages, we cannot expect our English to continue long in its purity. When charged with this, we have too often been satisfied with stout denials, instead of trying to prevent the evil. Every year however the denial must become less and less easy. While we protest against the spirit of the passage from which the following remarks are taken, we cannot but admit the force of the remarks themselves: "Far severed from the original spring of English undefiled, the Americans always run the risk of sinking into provincialisms, into Patavinity, both positive, in the use of obsolete words, and the adoption of conventional village significations, which differ from those retained by us,—as well as negative, in the omission of those happy expressions which bear the fire-new stamp of the only authorized mint." We take it as a point granted, among all American scholars, that the erection of a separate dialect here, and the consequent segregation of our language and letters from that of the mother country, is an unqualified evil, to be forever deprecated, as baleful to our learning, as well as our Christian enterprise. Yet this is an evil to which some of our first scholars are hourly contributing, by their neglect of pure English authority, by their hasty patronage of big words from the Latin stock, usually coined by newspaper editors and second-rate speakers; and, last but not least, by the wanton adoption of novelties in orthography, which already distinguish at a glance almost all New England publications, and which, if they proceed, must in the course of time render a book from America disgusting to a British eye. The question is, not so much whether these changes are right or wrong, as whether it is expedient for us to set up a new or-

thography for ourselves, towards the adoption of which there is no tendency in Great Britain. We cannot but express our sincere regret that the American Tract Society, whose publications have so wide a circulation and influence, should have lent themselves to propagate the novel, and in a number of instances, absurd and ludicrous orthography of Webster's Dictionary, especially as the more refined scholars, even in Boston, and all except newspaper editors south of New York, adhere to those formulas of spelling, which occur in the first British publications, as for example, the Quarterly and Edinburgh Reviews.

One of the most important barriers against the flood which threatens our language, is the study of the Anglo-Saxon. The changes which have been wrought in English, by the adoption of words from the Latin or the French, while they add to the copiousness of the language, go to destroy its expressiveness and force. In almost every case where a foreign synonym has been introduced, some fine old English word has fallen into partial or entire disuse. "The facility and simplicity of combining several short indigenous words, to express any complex idea, practised by the Anglo-Saxons and other Gothic nations, is now," says Dr. Bosworth, "too seldom used. Instead of adopting technical terms from other languages, or forming them from the Greek or Latin, as is the present English custom, our Anglo-Saxon forefathers formed words equally expressive, by composing them from their own radical terms. For our *literature*, they used *boc-cræft*, *book-craft*, from *boc*, *a book*, *cræft*, *art*, science; for *arithmetic*, *rimcræft*, from *rim*, *a number*, *cræft*, *art*." Let us also hear the judgment of a learned foreigner; "If the syntax of the Anglo-Saxon," says Halbertsma, "be the basis of the English Syntax, as I think it is, notwithstanding a partial degeneracy, since the Norman conquest, by a mixture with French, the absurdity is felt of modelling the construction of the English according to that of corrupt Latin, known by the name of French. The construction of the French language is as regularly arranged as the pipes of an organ, while the most diversified inversion, exceeded only by that of the Latin and Greek, characterizes the Anglo-Saxon and Friesic; and the more the English is made to differ from this standard of propriety, the more it deviates from its original form and its very nature." Even though we borrow from a better language, we do not always improve, for, as Dr. Campbell observes, a mixture of two liquors is often worse than

either. The Romans corrupted the Augustan purity of their tongue by borrowing from the Greek, while the long continued energy of the Greek language, was owing mainly to its rejection of all words but its own. And while we are laboriously bringing in difficult polysyllables from the Latin, the Dutch and Germans are emulating the Greeks, by carefully weeding out hundreds of words which had crept in from the classic tongues, and substituting compounds from the stores of their native Saxon.

Viewing our language as it now stands, we may observe that the great foundation of it is Teutonic. Almost all the verbs, particles, and other words which constitute the body, the frame work of our discourse, are Saxon. Being more the language of the field and the fireside, they come home to our business and bosoms. While juvenile and late-learned writers are enamoured of sesquipedalian terms of Roman origin, our best authors and orators, our Websters and Southards and Irvings know the power of the racy Saxon roots. To this treasury they resort, as we must all do, for tender, gentle, comprehensive, as well as picturesque and powerful words. Turner, in his History of the Anglo-Saxons, has shown how many of our words are thus derived, by giving passages of the most eminent writers, both in poetry and prose, of different ages, with the words of Saxon origin printed in italics. Our learned fellow-citizen, Mr. Duponceau, says, "So far as we are able to judge, from a superficial investigation of the subject, we are apt to believe that the English words of northern derivation, are to those derived from the ancient as well as the modern languages of Southern Europe, in the proportion of something more than *three*, but not quite as much as *four to one*." An estimate somewhat different, is made by Halbertsma. "My object," says he, "was to show the analogy between the two languages, (Friesic and English,) by translating them as literally as possible; and the cognate words in English, which do not perfectly agree with the Friesic in sense, I have explained by others in parenthesis. In 1200 words I have only had recourse to fifty, which are not of Saxon origin—a number which might be greatly diminished by a scholar, thoroughly acquainted with the original stores of the English language. At this rate, about every twenty-fourth word of the original fund of the language is lost. In one hundred and twenty-five words in parenthesis, I used fifty foreign words: here one word is lost out of every two and a half. The number of words

was twelve hundred; add the words in parentheses, one hundred and twenty-five, it makes a total of thirteen hundred and twenty five. The foreign words in twelve hundred were fifty, and in parentheses fifty, making the sum of one hundred. Then thirteen hundred and twenty-five divided by one hundred, gives thirteen and a quarter, which shows that there is one foreign word for every thirteen English." The only remark which need be added, is that the passages by Halbertsma, as the subject of his investigation, were constructed on the plan of avoiding Latin terms in every possible case.

Every careful student of English literature has observed that if there exist two synonymous words, one of Latin and the other of Saxon origin, the former is generally more expressive and poetical, and especially more available for reaching the common mind: for example, *fatherly*, *motherly*, *brotherly*, and paternal, maternal, fraternal; *happiness*, and felicity; *faithfulness* and fidelity; *kindred* and relation; *witchcraft*, necromancy; *burst*, rapture; *strength*, vigour; *storm*, tempest; *tearful*, lackrymose; *offering*, oblation; *mirth*, hilarity; *heartly*, cordial; *dwelt*, lodge; *bereave*, deprive. In Shakspeare, and in the English version of the Bible, some of the most striking and tender passages owe these qualities, in a great degree, to the predominance of the Saxon element, and if the experiment be made of exchanging these for words of Roman or Latin derivation, the thoughts will be disparaged.

On such a topic, the judgment of so great a scholar as Mackintosh will carry weight. "From the Anglo-Saxon," says he, "we derive the names of most of the ancient officers among us; of the greater part of the divisions of the kingdom, and of almost all our towns and villages. From them also we derive our language, of which the structure and a majority of its words, much greater than those who have not thought on the subject, would at first easily believe, are Saxon. Of sixty-nine words which make up the Lord's Prayer, there are only five not Saxon;—the best example of the natural bent of our language, and of the words apt to be chosen by those who speak and write it without design. Of eighty-one words in the soliloquy of Hamlet, thirteen only are of Latin origin. Even in a passage of ninety words in Milton, whose diction is more learned than that of any other poet, there are only sixteen Latin words. In four verses of the authorized translation of Genesis, which con-

tains above one hundred and thirty words, there are no more than five Latin. In seventy-nine words of Addison, whose perfect taste preserved him from a pedantic or constrained preference for any portion of the language, we find only fifteen Latin. In later times, the language rebelled against the bad taste of those otherwise vigorous writers, who, instead of ennobling their style, like Milton, by the position and combination of words, have tried to raise it by unusual and far-fetched expressions. Dr. Johnson, himself, from whose corruptions English style is only recovering, in eighty-seven words of his fine parallel between Dryden and Pope, has found means to introduce no more than twenty-one of Latin derivation. The language of familiar intercourse, the terms of jest and pleasantry, and those of necessary business, the idioms and peculiar phrases into which words naturally run; the proverbs, which are the condensed and pointed sense of the people; the particles, on which our syntax depends, and which are of perpetual recurrence;—all these foundations of a language are more decisive proofs of the Saxon origin of ours, than even the great majority of Saxon words in writing, and the still greater majority in speaking. In all cases where we have preserved a whole family of words, the superior significancy of a Saxon over a Latin term is most remarkable. *Well-being arises from well-doing*, is a Saxon phrase, which may be thus rendered into the Latin part of the language:—*Felicity attends Virtue*; but how inferior in force is the latter! In the Saxon phrase, the parts or roots of words being significant in our language, and familiar to our eyes and ears, throw their whole meaning into the compounds and derivations; while the Latin words of the same import, having their roots and elements in a foreign language, carry only a cold and conventional signification to an English ear.”

To this we may add the opinion of one of the most harmonious and eloquent of modern English writers, the late Robert Hall. His biographer thus writes: “In one of my early interviews with Mr. Hall, I used the word *felicity* three or four times, in rather quick succession. He asked ‘Why do you say *felicity*, sir? *Happiness* is a better word, more musical and genuine English, coming from the Saxon.’ ‘Not more musical, I think, sir.’ ‘Yes, more musical, and so are words derived from the Saxon generally. Listen sir: *My heart is smitten and withered like grass*; there’s plaintive music. Listen again, sir: *Under the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice*. There’s cheerful music.’ ‘Yes, but *rejoice*

is French?' True, but all the rest is Saxon, and rejoice is almost out of tune with the other words. Listen again: *Thou hast delivered my eyes from tears, my soul from death, and my feet from falling*; all Saxon, sir, except *delivered*. Then, sir, for another specimen, and almost all good old Saxon English: *Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.*'"

At the time of the Reformation, and during most of the sixteenth century, we observe in English writers a marked predominance of the Saxon ingredient, which make the writers of that age peculiarly charming. The next age brought in many Latin and French words, so that the diction of that day was marred by an appearance of pedantry. This was especially the case in some writings of the time of Charles the Second. In the reign of Queen Anne, there was a return to the dignified purity of genuine English. The influence, however, of such writers as Johnson and Gibbon, tended to burden and corrupt our language, by needless importations from abroad. Of the latter, Hannah More said well, that if Gibbon had his will, the Christian religion and the English language would come to an end together. And at the present day, the wanton introduction of scientific terms from the Greek and Latin, and of phrases from the French, threatens to render our tongue still more piebald, heterogeneous and unwieldy. Still it may be observed in the citations just made, the suffrage of the most accomplished scholars, and eloquent writers, is wholly in favour of Saxon English. In our own country, indeed, the rage for what is sounding, pompous, swelling, and uncommon, leads our writers and speakers to deal much in words of Latin origin. In this respect the writers of our revolutionary period far surpass us. The English of Franklin, Adams, and Ames, is more chaste than that of our own day. Those, moreover, who most variegate their diction with uncommon, difficult, and polysyllabic phrases, are such as have come late and irregularly into the field of letters, and have least real acquaintance with the models of classical taste; just as we observe the greatest display of paste-diamonds and jeweller's gold upon those whose wealth and credit are somewhat disputable. Still the current is evidently setting back in favour of pure English, and in proportion to the demand for this, will be the avidity of scholars for the pristine literature of England. We hope to see, before many years, an allotment of time to Anglo-

Saxon in every college in America; and in preparation for this, we earnestly wish that some of our learned men would prepare suitable elementary books for publication. We know of no way in which we can so effectually aid the young Anglo-Saxon student, as by adding the bibliographical notices which follow.

“A CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE CHIEF WORKS PRINTED IN ANGLO-SAXON, WITH A NOTICE OF GRAMMARS AND DICTIONARIES INTENDED FOR JUNIOR STUDENTS.—[1567.] *ÆLFRIC*. 1. A Testimonie of Antiquitie showing the auncient fayth in the Church of England, touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lord here publicly preached, and also receiued in the Saxon's tyme, above 600 yeares agoe, 16mo. Imprinted at London by John Daye, dwelling over Aldersgate beneath S. Martyns, 1567. *This little book contains “A Sermon of the Paschall Lambe to be spoken unto the people at Easter.” Anglo-Saxon on the left-hand page and an English translation on the right. It is paged only on the right to 75. Then follow 13 leaves without being paged, containing the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the X Commandments in Saxon, with an interlinear English translation. The whole book, therefore, consists of 88 leaves, or 176 pages. It was published again in small 4to. with L'Isle's ‘Treatise concerning the Old and New Testament,’ in 1623: the Easter Homily was printed again in the 2d vol. of Fox's ‘Acts and Monuments,’ and in the notes to Whelock's ‘Bede,’ b. v. c. 22. In the year of L'Isle's death, it appeared again with this title, “Divers ancient Monuments in the Saxon Tongue,” &c. 4to. 1638.—[1568.] LAWS. 2. *Ἀρχαιονομία*, sive de priscis Anglorum Legibus libri, Sermone Anglico, vetustate antiquissimo aliquot abhinc seculis conscripti, atque nunc demum magno Jurisperitorum et amantium antiquitatis omnium commodo, e tenebris in lucem vocati, Gulielmo Lambardo, 4to. ex officina Johan. Daye, Lond. 1568. *A greatly improved edition was published by Whelock, in folio, Cambridge, 1644, pp. 226, 1l. A still better edition, so much enlarged and improved as to be considered almost a new work, was published with the following title: “Leges Anglo-Saxonicae Ecclesiasticæ et Civiles, accedunt Leges Edvardi Latinæ, Gulielmi Conquestoris Gallo-Normannicæ, et Henrici I. Latinæ, subjungitur Domini Henr. Spelmanni Codex Legum Veterum Statutorum Regni Angliæ, quæ ab ingressu Guliel-**

mi I. usque ad annum nonum Henr. III. edita sunt; toti Operi præmittitur Dissertatio Epistolaris admodum Reverendi Domini Gulielmi Nicolsoni Episcopi, Derrensis De Jure Feudali Veterum Saxonum, cum Codd. MSS. contulit, notas, versionem, et glossarium adjecit David Wilkens, S. T. P. fol. Lond. 1721, p. 234, 2l. 12s. 6d. *These are in Anglo-Saxon, with Latin translation and notes.*—Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen. In der Ursprache mit Uebersetzung und Erläuterungen herausgegeben von Dr. Reinhold Schmid, Professor der Rechte zu Jena, 8vo. Leipzig, 1832, pp. 304, about 8s. *There are two columns in a page; on the left is the Anglo-Saxon text, in Roman type, and on the right a German translation. The second volume has long been expected. The Record Commission have undertaken an edition with an improved Anglo-Saxon text, carefully accented, and accompanied with an English translation and notes. It was prepared, and a considerable part printed, under the superintendence of the late Richard Price, Esq. whose critical acquaintance with the Anglo-Saxon has been manifested by his excellent edition of Warton's "History of English Poetry." This edition of the A.-S. Laws by Mr. Price, is not yet published.*—[1571.] GOSPELS. 3. The Gospels of the fower Euangelists, translated in the olde Saxon tyme, out of Latin into the vulgare toung of the Saxons, newly collected out of auncient monumentes of the said Saxons, and now published for testimonie of the same, 4to. London, printed by John Daye, 1571. *It is accompanied with an English version out of the Bishop's Bible, so altered as to agree with the Saxon, and published by Fox, the Martyrologist at the expense of Archbishop Parker. Price 3l. 3s.*—Quatuor D.N. Jesu Christi Evangeliorum Versiones per antiquæ duæ, Gothica scil. et Anglo-Saxonica: quarum illam ex celeberrimo Codice Argenteo nunc primum depromsit Franciscus Junius, hanc autem ex Codd. MSS. collatis emendatiùs recudi curavit Thomas Mareschallus Anglus; cujus etiam observationes in utramque versionem subnectuntur. Accessit et Glossarium Gothicum: cui præmittitur Alphabetum Gothicum, Runicum, &c. operâ ejusdem Francisci Junii, 4to. Dordrecht, 1665, et Amsterdam, 1684, p. 383—431, 2l. 8s. *The Amsterdam edition appears, on collation, to be made up from the old copies with new title-pages, and a re-print of the first sheet in vol. ii. Moes. Glos.* The Anglo-Saxon Gospels from the text of Marshall, the Rushworth Gloss, MS. Bodl. together

with all the A.-S. translations of the Gospels, are about to appear in a quarto volume from the Pitt Press, Cambridge. —[1623.] **ÆLFRIC.** 4. A Saxon Treatise concerning the Old and New Testament. Written about the time of King Edgar (700 yeares agoe) by Ælfrievs Abbas, thought to be the same that was afterwards Archbishop of Canterbvrie. Whereby appeares what was the Canon of holy Scripture then receiued, and that the Church of England had it so along agoe in her mother-tongue. Now first pvlished in print with English of our times by WILLIAM L'ISLE of Wilbyrgham, Esquier for the King's bodie: the originall remaining still to be seene at Sir Robert Cotton's Librarie, at the end of his lesser Copie of the Saxon Pentatevch. And herevnto is added ovt of the Homilies and Epistles of the fore-said Ælfrievs, a second edition of *A Testimonie of Antiquitie, &c. touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloud of the LORD*, here publikely preached and receiued in the Saxon's time, &c. London, printed by John Haviland for Henrie Seile, dwelling in Paul's Church-yard, at the signe of the Tyger's head, 1623, small 4to. *The Dedication, Preface, &c. contain 30 leaves, the paragraphs numbered, but not the pages; then follow 43 leaves of the Treatise of the Old and New Testament, Saxon on the left, and English on the right-hand page. The first 12 leaves are without numbers, 13 is placed at the head of the Saxon on the left, and also at the head of the English on the right page, the same numeral serving for two pages. The Testimony of Antiquity, &c. has 9 leaves of Preface, &c., 14 leaves with double numerals, of 'A Sermon of the Paschall Lambe, &c.:' then follow 11 leaves unpagged, containing the words of Elfrike Abbot, and the Lord's Prayer, Creed and X Commandments, in Saxon, with an interlinear English version, 30 + 43 + 9 + 14 + 11 = 107 leaves, or 214 pages.*—[1640.] **PSALMS.** 5. Psalterium Davidis Latino-Saxonicum Vetus, à Johanne Spelmanno, D. Hen. fil. editum, 4to. Londini, 1640, 1l. 1s.—Libri Psalmorum versio antiqua Latini; cum paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica, partim soluta oratione, partim metricè composita, nunc primum e cod. MSS. in Bibl. Regia Parisiensi adservato, descripsit et edidit Benjamin Thorpe, S.A.S. Soc. Lit. Isl. Hafn. Soc. Hon. 8vo. Ovonii, 1835.—[1644.] **BEDE.** 6. Bedæ Venerabilis Historia Ecclesiastica Anglorum, Anglo-Saxonice ex versione Ælfredi Magni Gentis et Latinè, accessère Chronologia Saxonica (*The Saxon Chronicle*, see 9.) et Leges Anglo-Saxonice cum interpreta-

tione Latinâ, curâ Abrahami Wheloci, fol. Cantabrigiæ, 1644. *A much improved and splendid edition was published with the following title* : “ Bedæ Historia Ecclesiastica, Latinè et Saxonice ; una cum reliquis ejus operibus Historicis Latinè, curâ et studio Johannis Smith, S.T.P. fol. Cantabrigiæ 1722, pp. 823, 2l. 16s.—[1655.] CÆDMON. 7. Cædmonis Monachi Paraphrasis Poetica Genesios ac præcipuarum sacræ paginæ historiarum, abhinc annos M.LXX. Anglo-Saxonice conscripta, et nunc primum edita à Francisco Junio, Amst. 1655, pp. 116. 1l.—Cædmon’s Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures, in Anglo-Saxon, with an English translation, notes, and a verbal index, by Benjamin Thorpe, F.S.A. 8vo. London, 1832, pp. 341, 1l. 1s.—[1659.] ÆLFRIC. 8. Ælfrici abbatis Grammatici vulgo dicti Grammatica Latino-Saxonica, &c. Guliel. Somnerus, fol. Oxon. 1659, pp. 52. *This is a Latin Grammar written in Anglo-Saxon for the use of those Saxon youths who were studying Latin. It is appended to Somner’s A.-S. Dictionary, see 22.*—[1692.] CHRONICLE. 9. Chronologica Anglo-Saxonica, curâ Abrahami Wheloci fol. Cantabrigiæ, 1644. *Appended to Whelock’s edition of Bede, see Bede, 6.*—Chronicon Saxonicum; seu Annales Rerum in Angliâ præcipue gestarum ad annum MCLIV.; cum indice rerum chronologico. Accedunt regulæ ad investigandas nominum locorum origines; et nominum et virorum in Chronico memoratorum explicatio; Latinè et Anglo-Saxonice, cum notis Edmundi Gibson, 4to. Oxon. 1692, 2l. 8s.—The Saxon Chronicle, with an English translation, and notes, critical and explanatory, and chronological, topographical and glossarial indexes; a short Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon language, by the Rev. James Ingram B.D.; a new Map of England during the Heptarchy, plates of Coins, 4to. 1823, pp. 463, 3l. 13s. 6d. *The Saxon Chronicle has been translated into English, and printed with an improved A.-S. text, carefully accented from MSS. by the late Richard Price, Esq. for the Record Commission. It is not yet published. Miss Gurney printed and circulated privately among her friends, a very useful work entitled ‘A literal Translation of the Saxon Chronicle, 12mo. Norwich, 1819, pp. 324. with 48 pages of Index.*—[1698.] ÆLFRIC’s Bible. 10. Heptateuchus, Liber Job, et Evangelium Nicodemi, Anglo-Saxonice. Historiæ Judith Fragmentum; Dano-Saxonice, edidit nunc primum ex MSS., Codicibus Edvardus Thwaites, 8vo. Oxon. 1698, pp. 168 + 30 = 198, 1l. 4s. *The first seven books*

of the Bible in Anglo-Saxon.—[1698.] ALFRED's *Boethius*. 11. Boethii (An. Manl. Sever.) Consolationis Philosophiæ libri V. Anglo-Saxonice redditi ab Ælfredo; ad Apographum Junianum expressos edidit Christophorus Rawlinson, 8vo. Oxon. 1698, 1l. 8s.—King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version of Boethius, de Consolatione Philosophiæ; with an English translation and notes, by J. S. Cardale, 8vo. London, 1829, pp. 425, 1l. 5s.—King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version of the Metres of Boethius, with an English translation and notes, by the Rev. Samuel Fox, M.A. 8vo. London, 1835, pp. 144, 12s.—[1709.] ELSTOB's *Hom.* 12. An English-Saxon Homily on the Birth-day of St. Gregory, anciently used in the English-Saxon Church, giving an account of the Conversion of the English from Paganism to Christianity; translated into modern English, with Notes, &c. by Elizabeth Elstob, 8vo. London, 1709, pp. Preface, lx. 44 + 10 + 49 = 103, 1l. 4s. *This work is in Anglo-Saxon and English. She also printed some sheets in folio of Anglo-Saxon Homilies, with an English translation. For reasons now unknown the press was stopped. A copy of what was printed is in the British Museum.*—[1773.] ALFRED's *Oros.* 13. The Anglo-Saxon version from the historian Orosius, by Alfred the Great, together with an English translation from the Anglo-Saxon, (by Daines Barrington), 8vo. London, 1773; Anglo-Saxon, pp. 242, English translation and notes, pp. 259, about 1l. 5s.—ALFRED's *Will.* 14. Ælfred's Will, in Anglo-Saxon, with a literal and also a free English translation, a Latin version, and notes, (by the Rev. Owen Manning,) royal 4to. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1838, pp. 51, about 7s. The same, reprinted from the Oxford edition of 1788, with a preface and additional notes, (by Mr. Cardale) London, Pickering, Combe, Leicester, 8vo. 1828, pp. 32, price 5s.—[1815.] BEOWULF. 15. De Danorum Rebus Gestis Secul. III. et IV. Poëma Danicum, Dialecto Anglo-Saxonica, ex Bibliotheca Cottoniana Musæi Brittannici edidit versione Latinâ et indicibus, auxit, Grim Johnson Thorkelin, Dr. J. V. &c. 4to. Havniæ, 1815, pp. 299, 14s.—*An analysis of this fine poem, and an English translation of a considerable part of it, has been given by Mr. Turner in his History of the Anglo-Saxons, b. ix. c. 2, vol. iii. p. 280-301. A still more complete analysis is given, with free translations in English verse, and a literal Latin version from a text formed from a careful collation with the MSS. in Conybeare's Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry, p. 30-167.*

—*A very neat edition of the Anglo-Saxon text has appeared, entitled 'The Anglo-Saxon Poems of Beowulf; the Traveller's Song, and the Battle of Finnes-burh, edited, together with a Glossary of the more difficult words, and an historical Preface, by John M. Kemble, Esq. M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge,' small 8vo. London, 1833, pp. 259, 13s. A second edition, with an English translation and a complete Glossary, is on the eve of publication.*—[1826.] CONYBEARE'S *Poetry*. 16. *Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, by the Rev. John Josias Conybeare, M.A. late Anglo-Saxon Professor, &c. at Oxford, edited by his brother the Rev. W. D. Conybeare, M.A. &c. 8vo. London, 1826, pp. 286, 18s. [1830.] FOX'S *Menol.* 17. *Menologium, seu Calendarium Poeticum, ex Hiccesiano Thesaurο: or, The Poetical Calendar of the Anglo-Saxons, with an English translation and notes, by the Rev. Samuel Fox, M.A. 8vo. London, 1830, pp. 64, 6s.*—[1834.] THORPE'S *Analect.* 18. *Analecta Anglo-Saxonica*. A selection, in prose and verse, from Anglo-Saxon authors of various ages, with a Glossary; designed chiefly as a first book for students, by Benjamin Thorpe, F.S.A. 8vo. London, 1834, pp. 266, 20s. *This work gives specimens of Anglo-Saxon from its purest to its most corrupt state. As some of the specimens have been taken from MSS. and are here printed for the first time, this useful book has properly a place here.*—[1834.] THORPE'S *Apoll.* 19. The Anglo-Saxon version of the story of Apollonius of Tyre, upon which is founded the play of Pericles, attributed to Shakespeare; from a MS. in the library of C.C.C. Cambridge, with a literal translation, &c. by Benjamin Thorpe, F.S.A. 12mo. London, 1834, pp. 92, 6s.—20. A MORE minute account of works printed in the Anglo-Saxon, especially of smaller detached pieces, may be found in p. 134 of Hickes's *Institutiones Grammaticæ Anglo-Saxonicæ*, 4to. Oxoniæ, 1680; and Wanley's *Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon MSS. forming the 3rd vol. of Hickes's Thesaurus*, p. 325. *A short notice of the principal A.-S. MSS. may be found in Hickes's Institutiones, from p. 135 to 176, but a minute account of all the A.-S. MSS. with many very interesting and valuable extracts, will be found in Wanley's Catalogue, which, as the 3rd vol. of Hickes's Thesaurus, has the following title: 'Antiquæ Literaturæ Septentrionalis Liber alter, seu Humphredi Wanleii Librorum Veterum Septentrionalium qui in Angliæ Bibliothecis extant, nec non multorum Veterum Codicum Septentrionalium alibi extantium Catalogus Histori-*

co-Criticus, cum totius Thesauri Linguarum Septentrionalium sex Indicibus, fol. Oxoniæ, 1705.—*An arranged Catalogue of all the extant relics of A.-S. poetry is given in Conybeare's Illustrations of A.-S. Poetry*, p. lxxvi—lxxxvi.

“21. GRAMMARS. 1. Hickes's Institutiones Gram. A.-S. 4to. Oxon. 1689, 2*l*.—2. Hickes's Thesaurus, 3 vols. fol. Oxon. 1705, 12*s*.—3. (Thwaites's) Gram. A.-S. ex Hiccesiano, 8vo. pp. 48, 2*l*.—4. Elstob's (Eliz.) Gram. of English-Saxon tongue, 4to. Lond. 1715, 1*l*.—5. Henley's Gram. of Anglo-Saxon, Lond. 1726, pp. 61, 4*s*.—6. Lye's Gram. Anglo-Saxon, prefixed to Junius's Etymologicum, fol. Oxon. 1743.—7. Manning's Gram. Anglo-Saxon et Mæso-Goth. prefixed to his edition of Lye's A.-S. Dict. 2 vols. fol. Lond. 1772.—8. Rask's Angelsaksish Sproglære, 8vo. Stockholm, 1817, pp. 168; Mr. Thorpe's Translation of ditto, 8vo. Copenhagen, 1830, 15*s*. 6*d*.—9. Sisson's Elements of A.-S. Gram. 12mo. Leeds, 1819, pp. 84, 5*s*.—10. Dr. Jacob Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik, 3 vols. 8vo. Gottingen, 1822, 1826, 1831. *This is a Grammar of all the Germanic languages; it is the 2nd edit.*—11. Bosworth's Elements of A.-S. Gram. 8vo. 1823, pp. 330, 16*s*.—Bosworth's Compendious Gram. of Primitive Eng. or A.-S. 8vo. 1826, pp. 84, 5*s*.—12. Ingram's Short Gram. of A.-S. prefixed to his edition of the Saxon Chronicle, 4to. 1823, pp. 8.—13. Gwilt's Rudiments of A.-S. 8vo. Lond. 1829, pp. 56, 6*s*.

“22. DICTIONARIES. Somner's Dict. Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum, folio, Oxon. 1659, 8*l*.—2. Benson's Vocabularium A.-S. 8vo. Oxon. 1701, 1*l*. 4*s*.—3. Lye's Dictionarium Saxonico et Gothico-Latinum, published by Manning, in 2 vols. fol. Lond. 1772, 7*l*. 17*s*. 6*d*.

“*Works relating to Anglo-Saxon.*—[1650.] 23. CASAU-BONI (Merici) de Linguâ Saxonica et de Linguâ Hebraicâ Commentarius; accesserunt Gulielmi Somneri ad verba vetera Germanica Lipsiana notæ, small 8vo. Londini, 1650, 8*s*. 6*d*.—[1678.] ALFRED's *Life*. 24. Ælfredi Magni Vita, à Joanne Spelman, plates, folio, Oxon. 1678, about 16*s*.—[1709.] Ælfred's *Life*, by Sir John Spelman, Knt. from the original manuscript in the Bodleian Library, with considerable additions, and several historical remarks, by the publisher Thomas Hearne, M. A. small 8vo. Oxford, 1709, about 9*s*.—*Life of Alfred or Alured*, by Robert Powell, 18mo. 1634, about 5*s*.—Ælfredi Regis præfatio ad Pastorale Sancti Gregorii, e Codd. MS. Jun. LIII. *Saxon and Latin*. See *Asserii Meneven. Ælfredi*, p. 81.—[1722.] Asserii Mene-

vensis Annales Rerum Gestarum Ælfredi Magni, recensuit Franciscus Wise, M.A. small 8vo. Oxon. 1722, about 9s.—Mr. Turner's Hist. of Anglo-Saxons, b. iv. c.—11, and b. v. c. 1—6.—[1708.] WOTTON'S *View*. 25. Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesauri Grammatico-Critici et Archæologici, auctore Georgio Hickesio, Conspectus brevis, cum notis, Gulielmo Wotton, 12mo. 12s.—[1708.] Wotton's Short View of George Hickes's Grammatico-Critical and Archeological Treasury of the Ancient Northern Languages, translated, with notes, by Maurice Shelton, 4to. London, 1737.—[1715.] ELSTOB'S *Saxon Devotion*. 26. Publick Office of daily and nightly devotion for the seven canonical hours of prayer, used in the Anglo-Saxon Church, with a translation and notes, together with the Rev. Dr. George Hickes's Controversial Discourses, by W. Elstob, 1 vol. 8vo, 1705, London, 5s.; the same, 2 vols. 8vo. 16s. 1715-27.—[1726.] GAVELKIND. 27. Somner's (William) Treatise of Gavelkind, both name and thing, showing the True Etymologie and Derivation of the One, the Nature, Antiquity and Original of the Other. To which is added the Life of the Author, by Bishop White Kennett, 4to. London, 1726. 17s.—[1798.] HENSHALL. 28. The Saxon and English Languages reciprocally illustrative of each other; the impracticability of acquiring an accurate knowledge of Saxon Literature through the medium of Latin Phraseology, exemplified in the errors of Hickes, Wilkins, Gibson, and other scholars; and a new mode suggested of radically studying the Saxon and English Languages, by Samuel Henshall, M.A. 4to. London, 1798, pp. 60. 5s.—[1807.] INGRAM. 29. An Inaugural Lecture on the utility of Anglo-Saxon Literature; to which is added the Geography of Europe, by King Alfred, including his account of the Discovery of the North Cape in the 9th century, by the Rev. James Ingram, M.A. 4to. Oxford, 1807, pp. 112. 10s. 6d.—[1807.] HENSHALL. 30. The Etymological Organic Reasoner; with part of the Gothic Gospel of St. Matthew, from the Codex Argenteus (Cent. IV.) and from the Saxon Durham Book (Cent. VIII.), with an English Version, 8vo. 1807. 5s.—[1822.] SILVER. 31. A Lecture on the Study of the Anglo-Saxon, (by the Rev. Thomas Silver, D. D.), 8vo. Oxford, 1822, 3s.—[1830.] 32. MONE'S (Franz Joseph) Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Teutschen Lit. und Sprache, 8vo. Leipzig, 1830, 10s.—[1833.] 33. COLLEN'S (George William) Britannia Saxonica, a Map of Britain during the Octarchy, 4to. London, 1833,

12s.—[1799-1834.] 34. TURNER'S (Sharon) History of the Anglo-Saxons; comprising the History of England from the earliest period to the Norman Conquest, 3 vols. 8vo. 5th edit. London, 1834, 2l. 5s.—PALGRAVE'S (Sir Francis) Hist. of A.-S. 16mo. Lond. 1831. pp. 391, 5s.—PALGRAVE'S Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth, 4to. London, 1834, 3l. 3s. *Mr. Turner and Sir F. Palgrave's important works must be carefully read by every A.-S. student. These for History, and Rask and Grimm for Philology, are rich sources of information for those who are interested in the Anglo-Saxon language and literature."*

ART. VI.—*Decretum Synodi Nationalis Ecclesiarum Reformatarum Galliae initio Anni 1645, de imputatione primi peccati omnibus Adami posteris, cum Ecclesiarum et Doctorum Protestantium consensu, ex scriptis eorum, ab Andrea Riveto collecto.* (Rivet. Opp. tom. iii.) Rotterdam. folio. 1660.

JOSHUA PLACAEUS, Professor of Theology in the celebrated school at Saumur, published, towards the middle of the seventeenth century, the doctrine, that original sin consists merely in the hereditary corruption of our nature, without any direct imputation of the first sin of Adam to his posterity. The case was brought before the National Synod of the French Reformed Churches, which met at Charenton, near Paris, in 1645. The name of Placaeus was not mentioned, but the doctrine which he taught was examined and condemned. The decree of the Synod was as follows:

‘Whereas a report has been made to the Synod of certain writings, printed and manuscript, by which the nature of original sin is made to consist solely in the hereditary corruption, originally residing in all men, but the imputation of the first sin of Adam is denied; the Synod condemns the aforesaid doctrine, so far as it restricts the nature of original sin to the mere hereditary corruption of Adam's posterity, excluding the imputation of the first sin by which he fell; and, under the penalty of censures of all kinds, forbids all pastors, professors, and others, who may treat this subject, to depart from the common opinion of all Protestant churches, which,

besides corruption, have always acknowledged the aforesaid imputation to the whole posterity of Adam. And (the national synod) commands all synods and classes, in taking steps for the reception of students into the sacred ministry, to require of them subscription to this statute.' (Act. Syn. Char. c. 19. art. 1.)

Placaeus now contended that he was not touched by this decree, because, he said, he did not absolutely deny imputation of every kind, but only that which was immediate and antecedent. He invented a distinction between *mediate* and *immediate* imputation; immediate imputation being that which, in the order of nature, precedes inherent corruption; mediate imputation that which, in the order of nature, is consequent and dependent on corruption.

Placaeus, though an able man and learned theologian, had, at that time, few followers. His doctrine was repudiated by the protestant theologians of the day, with almost unanimous consent. Nevertheless, many treatises were written, to refute this new form of error. And as he claimed some of the earlier divines, and even the reformers, as agreeing with him, Andrew Rivet, the greatest theologian of the age, to show that such pretensions were unfounded, and to vindicate the decree of the synod, which declared that the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity was the doctrine of all the protestant churches, undertook the labour of collecting testimonies from the formulas of churches, and the writings of the most distinguished theologians, on the subject. As these testimonies are highly interesting at the present time, and as the volume which contains them is accessible to few, we propose to lay some of them before our readers, in a literal translation. In making the selection, we shall omit some testimonies, which, however clear and satisfactory as to the question in dispute, have now less interest than they had at first, because the writers are at present little known. The churches or theologians bearing testimony, will be indicated by the titles of the paragraphs.

First Helvetic Confession, 1538.

Since man was made holy by God, and fell into sin by his own fault, he drew with himself into the same ruin the human race, and rendered them obnoxious to the same calamity. And this defilement, which is called original, has so pervaded the whole race, that the child of wrath and enemy of

God can be cured by no help but that of God through Christ.

Latter Helvetic Confession, 1566.

Such as Adam became after the fall, such are all those descended from him; that is to say, they are equally obnoxious to sin, death, and all sorts of calamities.

Confession of Basel.

We acknowledge that man was originally created in the image of God, in righteousness and holiness; but that of his own accord he fell into sin; BY WHICH FALL the whole human race was rendered corrupt, and made obnoxious to condemnation.

Confession of the Bohemians or Waldenses.

The FIRST, the greatest, and most grievous of all sins, was undoubtedly the sin of Adam, which the Apostle calls 'the disobedience;' by which death reigns over all, even over those who did not sin by a transgression of the same kind as that of Adam. The second sin is the sin of our origin, which is innate and hereditary. The virulence of this hereditary pollution, may be ascertained and estimated from its guilt and blameworthiness. (*de reatu et culpa*.)

French Confession.

We believe that the whole offspring of Adam was infected with this contagion which we call original sin; namely, a fault flowing from our propagation, &c. Let it suffice (to observe) that those things with which Adam was endowed, were not given TO HIMSELF ALONE, but to his posterity also.

Articles of the Church of England.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the fault or corruption of the nature of every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil; so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore in every person born into the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation; and this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated, &c.

Old Scottish Confession.

By the transgression of Adam, which is commonly called 'original sin,' the image of God in man is altogether defaced, and he and his posterity are by nature the enemies of God; bond-slaves of Satan, and the servants of sin, and so we, **IN HIS PERSON**, were despoiled of all those gifts, and fell into all this misery and curse. *These things cannot be said, without imputation. (Hæc sine imputatione dici non possunt.*

Belgic Confession.

We believe, that by the disobedience of Adam, the sin which is called original, is spread and diffused through the whole human race: but original sin is the corruption and hereditary vice of our whole nature, by which infants themselves, in the womb of their mother, are polluted: and which, as some noxious root, germinates every kind of sin in man. (Art. 15.)

Saxon Confession.

Original sin exists; and on account of the fall of our first parents, and in consequence of the depravation which followed their fall, they that are born are liable to the wrath of God, and deserving eternal damnation, unless remission be obtained through the Mediator. (Art. ii.)

Augsburg Confession.

The doctrine is, that after the fall of Adam, all men, propagated in a natural way, have original sin. But we understand that *original sin*, (as it is called by the holy fathers, and all the orthodox and pious men of learning in the church,) consists of the guilt in which we are involved by the fall of Adam, and by which we are exposed to the wrath of God and eternal death; and that corruption of human nature propagated from Adam. (Art. ii.)

Articles of Smalcald, written by Martin Luther.

Here, it must be confessed by us, that Paul in the 5th of the Romans, affirms that sin sprang from one man, Adam, and entered into the world, by whose disobedience all men were made sinners, subjected to death and the devil. This is called original, hereditary, principal, or radical sin.

Confession of Wittenberg.

We believe and confess that man was by God made just and wise originally, endowed with free will, and adorned

by the Holy Spirit; but afterwards, in consequence of disobedience, was deprived of the Holy Spirit, made the slave of Satan, and rendered obnoxious to corporal, as well as eternal damnation; and this evil not only seized upon Adam, but was propagated to all his posterity.

To these citations we may add, that the theologians who met at Marburg, to endeavour to settle the differences between the Lutherans and Zuinglians, about the presence of Christ in the sacrament, though unable to agree on this point, nevertheless drew up and subscribed a doctrinal confession, one article of which related to original sin, and is as follows: "In the fourth place, we believe that original sin is innate in us, and was propagated to us from Adam; and it is such a sin that it exposes all men to condemnation; so that unless Jesus Christ had interposed for us by his death and life, all men on account of original sin would have been condemned; nor could they have come into the kingdom of God, and to eternal happiness." These articles were subscribed by Luther, Melancthon, Jonas, Osiander, Brentius, Agricola, Œcolampadius, Zuingle, Bucer and Hedio.

Rivet then gives the testimonies and explanations of certain theologians, from different countries, who had subscribed the confessions before cited, beginning with those of Switzerland.

Wolfgang Musculus.

Let no one here allege, that as the universality expressed in the latter clause is restricted to the elect only, when it is said that the free gift came upon all men to justification of life; so in the former clause, when it is said, the condemnation comes upon all men, it may be referred to the reprobate only; for the comparison instituted between Adam and Christ will not admit of it, since according to this the evil propagated from Adam is *IMPUTED* to all those descended from him; and in like manner the good to all those who are justified by Christ. (Loc. Comm. cap. de Electione.)

Again, more expressly, in his exposition of Rom. v. 12: "Some expound the words *have sinned* (ἡμαρτον) on account of sin are condemned, or virtually are constituted sinners; which, indeed, is true; but there is no reason why you should not understand by it, the actual sin of Adam, in whom all that existed in his loins have sinned. For since we receive from Christ not only this benefit that we should

be virtually justified by his obedience; but this also, that by the very actual obedience of Christ, we obey the Father, as we are Christ's; so we are not only virtually made sinners in Adam, but are condemned for this very sin of Adam. Whence the apostle declares, that by the offence of one, or the *one offence*, judgment came upon all men to condemnation. (Comm. on Romans, ch. 5.)

Peter Viret, Pastor at Lausanne.

God permitted the fall and corruption of the whole human race, and of the whole nature of man, in the man first formed. (Instit. Christ. Dial. 1.)

Amandus Polanus, Professor at Basel.

The parts of original sin are two, "the crime of disobedience, or defection from God, while in the loins of Adam; and the corruption consequent upon the lapse of Adam, in the whole human nature. The fault of disobedience or defection from God while in the loins of Adam," is the first part of original sin, which is iniquity, or a stain from a blot contracted from that first sin, namely a privation of the due honour which should be present, of the nature of a bond obliging to punishment, and binding us in punishment. So that the sin was not that of Adam alone, but also ours, because not only did Adam sin, but we also, as in Adam the root of the whole human race sinned, and transgressed the law. Rom. v. 5, 12, 19. (Syntag. Theol. lib. vi. cap. 3)

Although after the fall, Adam committed other sins, yet none of them are imputed, but only the first, by which corruption and death were spread through all human nature, and were decreed upon us. This Paul teaches, Rom. v. 12. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," where he speaks of sin in the singular number, not of *sins*. So also, in the 16th verse, guilt (judgment) was of *one offence* unto condemnation. And in v. 17, "By one offence, death reigned by one," and in the 18th v. "By one offence guilt, (judgment) came upon all men to condemnation." (ibid.)

Henry Bullinger, Pastor and Professor at Zurich.

Sin is called original, or the sin of our birth, because it comes from our first origin, or is derived from our first parent upon all, by propagation or traduction. It derives its origin from the first formed man, and hence it is termed, the hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature. Moreover,

this evil flowed from our first parents to all their posterity. (Decad. III. Serm. 10.)

After men became obnoxious to punishment, so far were we from having any power by which we could deliver ourselves, that, by reason of our native and inherent depravity, we rather increase the same. (Compend. Relig. Christ. v. 5.)

Peter Martyr, Professor at Zurich.

After discussing the import of the phrase ἐφ' ᾧ, in the person of Photius, maintaining the Latin interpretation *in whom*, that is, *in Adam all have sinned*, he proceeds to observe, "But I am not disposed keenly to contend for this interpretation, for I admit that ἐφ' ᾧ is a causal particle, so that the sense may be, that death has passed upon all men, *because that all have sinned*. For Chrysostom says, by the fall of Adam, Paul has determined, that other mortals who did not eat of the tree are infected; and as a prudent physician, when about to administer for a particular disease, does not delay in the mere circumstances or sequences, but has recourse to the head and primary cause: thus, *all die because all sinned*. Nor should we in this place take the word *sinned* in such a sense, as would render it inapplicable to infants; but as though he had said, they are held in sin, and are esteemed guilty, (*Rei*) for he was able from explanations given in the Epist. to Hebrews, to declare, 'HOW WE SINNED IN THE FALL OF ADAM;' for there we read, that Levi paid tithes while in the loins of Abraham. By the same reason it may here be understood, that we were contaminated in the loins, in the mass of Adam. (Comm. on Rom. ch. 5.) A little after, he says, 'For as by the disobedience of one man sin entered into the world,' the apostle declares what sin it was, which by one man entered into the world, and by which death passed upon all men: it was the disobedience of the first man, which he signifies was communicated to all, when he says, 'by it many were constituted sinners.' (ib.)

Original sin is a depravation of the whole nature of man, derived from the fall of our first parents to their posterity by generation; which, unless the benefit of Christ's mediation prevents, will subject all who are born into the world, to infinite evils, and to eternal damnation. (ibid.)

The efficient cause is the sinning will of Adam. When, therefore, he seems to assert that the sin for which we are condemned, is not another's, but our own, he means that the

sin of Adam was not so the sin of another, but that it was ours also; besides he had respect to that error of Peghius, that original sin consists in nothing else but the imputation of Adam's sin; for he did not acknowledge innate depravity, or denied that it partook of the nature of sin. (ibid.)

In the fifth chapter of Romans it is written "*In whom all sinned;*" which refers to Adam: for, these words ἐφ' ᾧ cannot refer to the word sin, for according to the syntax of the Greek language, the pronoun, in that case, must have been in the feminine gender, and the apostle should have said ἐφ' ἧ; the true sense then is that we sinned in the fall of Adam. And we have the same mode of speaking, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, where he declares that Levi paid tithes, while yet in the loins of Abraham, who, according to the genealogy, was the fourth from him in the line of descent. Now, as it is said, that while in the loins of Abraham, he paid tithes to Melchisedek; by the same reason all men were contained in Adam, when he sinned, &c. (Comm. on 1 Cor. ch. 15.)

Stephen Fabritius of Berne.

Since Adam representatively bore the person of the whole human race, whatever of good or evil he received of God, he received for himself and for others. 1 Cor. xv. 22. Besides, when Adam sinned, his posterity were in his loins, and to be propagated from him by the laws of nature, and thus they inherit guilt from him. Heb. vii. 9. (Concion. in Psalm 51.)

John Wollebius, Professor at Basel.

The proximate cause of original sin is the guilt of the first sin, in regard to which the punishment of God is most just; namely, a part of that death which God threatened to man.

Although the soul of man is immediately breathed into us by God; yet united to the body it is truly guilty of the first sin which is imputed to the whole man, and so it is infected with that original stain. (Christ. Theol. lib. 1. cap. 10.)

John Calvin.

Although Calvin dwells chiefly on the description and proof of the natural corruption of all men, he shows also that this was the punishment of the first sin. "After the divine image was obliterated, he did not bear this punishment alone; as in the place of wisdom, virtue, sanctity, truth, justice, (in which

ornaments he had been clothed,) the basest plagues succeeded, blindness, impotency, impurity, &c. but he also involved and immersed his posterity in the same miseries. This is that hereditary corruption which the ancients called original sin; understanding by the word sin, the depravation of a nature before good and pure. Concerning which thing there was much contention among them, for nothing can be more remote from common sense, than that ALL SHOULD BECOME GUILTY, by THE SIN OF ONE. *That certainly cannot be done without the imputation of that one sin.* (Inst. lib. 2. cap. 1.)

And again, So undoubtedly it must be held, that Adam was not only the progenitor of human nature, but, as it were, the RADIX; and so in his deserved corruption, the race of man was vitiated. (ib. 66.)

The words are not obscure, that by the obedience of Christ many are justified, so by the disobedience of Adam, many were constituted sinners. Therefore, between these two, this is the relation, that the one destroyed us, involving us in his own ruin with himself; the other restores us by his grace to salvation. (ib.)

It is not lawful to interpret otherwise what is said, "that in Adam all die," than that he by sinning brought so great destruction and ruin, not only upon himself, but precipitated our nature also into the same destruction. (ib.)

With this we should be content, that whatever endowments the Lord was pleased to bestow upon human nature, were deposited with Adam, so that when he lost what he had received, the loss was not his only, but that of us all. (ib.)

Nor did it happen merely in a natural way, that all should fall by the sin of one parent: the Scriptures openly declare, that all men were bound over to eternal death, in the person of this one man. (lib. 3. cap. 23. sect. 7.)

Adam, the common father of all, by his rebellion, alienated himself from God; and the fountain of life and all good being forsaken, he rendered himself obnoxious to all miseries. Whence it comes to pass that every one of us is born infected with original sin, and from the very womb of our mother, we are under the curse of God, and condemned not only on account of the crime of another, but on account of the depravity which is then within us, though it does not yet appear. (Confession of Faith.)

In regard to man, we perceive in passing over the Scrip-

tures, that the thing is thus, that the whole human race has become corrupt by the fall of Adam, so that we have all become obnoxious to destruction and damnation, not only because Adam himself sinned, but because we ourselves are sinners from the womb. (Confession of the French Churches submitted to the Diet at Frankfort.)

But if it is proposed by you to subject God to the laws of nature, will you condemn him for injustice, because for the sin of one man we are all held implicated in the guilt of eternal death? One sinned; all are led to punishment; nor is that all, but from the sin of this one, all have contracted contagion; so that they are born corrupt, and infected with a death-bringing pollution. (Reply to one of his Calumniators.)

It should be remarked how God, in the person of Adam, created the whole human race, after his own image: so Adam, by sin, was not only despoiled of the gifts conferred, but was banished from God; and in consequence all his posterity. How was this? because according to the will of God, we were all included in his person. (Comm. on Job. ch. 14.)

It is worthy of remark, that there are two differences between Christ and Adam, concerning which the Apostle was silent, not because he thought they might be neglected, but because it did not pertain to his present argument to enumerate them. The first is, that by the sin of Adam we are not condemned BY IMPUTATION ALONE, as though the punishment of another's sin was exacted of us; but we so bear his punishment, because we also are guilty of his fault; for because our nature was vitiated in him, it is with God bound by the guilt of iniquity. Here then we have the two things, *not only the imputation of the first sin; but also our own fault, since our nature is corrupted.* (Comm. on Rom. v. 17.)

Theodore Beza.

Two things should be considered in original sin, namely, **guilt** and **corruption**; which although they cannot be separated, yet ought to be distinguished accurately. For as Adam, by the commission of sin, first was made **GUILTY** of the wrath of God, then as being guilty, he underwent as the punishment of his sin, the corruption of soul and body. So also he transmitted to posterity a nature, in the first place **GUILTY**, next, **corrupted**. Concerning the propagation of guilt,

the apostle is properly treating in this passage, in contrast with which the IMPUTATION of the obedience of Christ is set forth. *Hence it follows, that that guilt which precedes corruption, is by the imputation of Adam's disobedience; as the remission of sins, and the abolition of guilt is by the imputation of the obedience of Christ. Nothing can be plainer.* (Note on Rom. v. 12.)

Lambert Danæus Aurelius S. Theol. D. & Professor in the Academy of Geneva, Leyden, &c.

Original sin flows from parents to their children, by the ordination of God, constituting and placing Adam for the whole human species, as he constituted and substituted Christ as the second Adam for all the elect. 'That first sin rendered them GUILTY before God, then the corruption (which followed guilt in Adam,) was transferred into us; on the account of this inhering in us, we are now guilty, as infected with our own depravity—vile, and spotted, and hateful to God, NOT ONLY IN ADAM, or as we are viewed in him as the fountain and root of the human race, but as we are considered in ourselves and from ourselves corrupted.'

Again. The guilt and punishment of the sin of Adam have passed upon all the posterity of Adam and Eve, Christ excepted.

All men, the posterity of Adam, are BY NATURE GUILTY before God, involved in that sin, and are children of wrath. Hence, both in mind and body, we bear the punishment which we before described; for the opinion is false, that punishment alone flowed to us on account of this sin, and not the GUILT and fault, for in that case we should be punished as undeserving; but first the sin, then the punishment, passes over, and is laid upon us. Therefore, by one man sin entered into the world, that is guilt, and that indeed first in order, and by sin, death; and so the penalty, both in soul and body, afterwards pervaded all men also. For in one Adam they sinned, and are constituted guilty before God. But why was this? Because Adam not only was the propagator, but also the fountain and root of the whole human race, from which the pollution and vitiosity descended, as into the branches propagated from this root, not only by imitation, but by the actual communication of the first sin, first of the fault (culpæ,) then of the corruption and vitiosity, both in mind and body.

Original sin then does not consist merely in imitation, nor solely IN IMPUTATION, but in inhesion, propagation, communication and instillation of that corruption and depravity, which Adam had himself contracted. And the same descends to us, and dwells in us. Therefore, when he sinned, Adam instilled his pollution into us all. (*Apologia pro Justif. per imputationem.*)

There are three things which constitute a man guilty before God. 1. The sin flowing from this that we have all sinned in the first man, Rom. v. 12. 2. Corruption which is the punishment of this sin, which fell upon Adam and all his posterity, Heb. ix. 27. 3. The (actual) sins which adult men commit, and which are fruits which this root of corruption brings forth, of which we are guilty before the judgment of God.

Anthony Fay, Pastor and Professor at Geneva.

All sinned in Adam, and by the sin of Adam, death passed on all men, because that sin had passed unto all. We sinned in him sinning; we died in his dying. Εφ' ὧ Theodoret takes as a causal particle, as if a reason should be rendered why death has passed upon all. Chrysostom understands εφ' ὧ in the same sense, namely, that all had become sinners; but it is better to take the preposition εφ' for ἐν as in Heb. ix. 10, so that it may be interpreted to relate to Adam, whose sin was common to all, as the penalty or death is common to all. (On Rom. v. 12.)

We believe that the sin of Adam, whilst it was the act of an individual, was common to the whole species, inasmuch as Adam was not made a private person, but was constituted by God the fountain of the whole race. For the human race lying hid in the loins of Adam, was adorned by God with original righteousness and grace; but by the sin of Adam, were despoiled of both. For as a murder perpetrated by the hand, is not imputed to the hand only, but to the whole body, not to Adam alone, who was but a member of the body of men, but to the whole race of men; therefore it is not of another's sin that we are reckoned guilty, but of our own; since in Adam we all eat of the forbidden fruit. (*Enchirid. Theologic. disp. 37. thes. 15—18.*)

A double disease pervaded the whole human race by the sin of Adam. The first is GUILT, by which all men are subjected to eternal death: the other is the corruption of the whole man, and of all his faculties of mind and body: by

reason of which he is neither willing nor able to be subject to the divine law. (Disp. 60. thes. 13.)

John Deodati, Professor and Pastor at Geneva.

This is the general conclusion of the preceding treatise concerning justification by faith, in which the apostle, after briefly repeating what had been said, at the same time declares their foundation, namely, that God out of his own good pleasure had constituted Christ the Head of grace, and fountain of righteousness and life to all his elect; by the imputation of whose righteousness, they return into favour with God, and consequently are sanctified and glorified. For as Adam was constituted the head and root of the whole human race, so that by THE IMPUTATION of his sin to all his posterity, they became obnoxious to the divine curse, are deprived of original righteousness, corrupted in their whole nature, and liable to death. (On Rom. v. 12.)

Benedict Turretin, Pastor and Professor at Geneva.

OUR CONFESSIONS include under original sin, the communion which we have in the first sin, and the loss of original righteousness and purity which we have sustained, and the inherent corruption of the soul. (On Rom. v. 12.)

Chrysostom, who well understood the import of the Greek word (*κατασταθήσονται*) explains it, by the fault and guilt into which we have fallen in Adam; by this first sin, having become guilty in the judgment of God. (On Rom. v. 18.)

Philip Mornay, Professor at Saumur.

We know whence proceeded the corruption of the human race, namely, from our grievous sin, and the punishment which followed it. We were all in the first man when he sinned. (De Verilat. Relig. Christ. cap. 16, 17.)

Since the whole human race was lost in Adam, and every one in himself, God so loved the world, that he gave the son of his love, as a price of redemption *for the sins of all those whom out of mere grace he gave to believe on him.* (In his Will.)

Francis Junius, Professor at Heidelberg and Leyden.

In the first Adam, the whole species was, by God, naturally deposited; in whom all sinned, and became guilty, and the children of wrath, and of an eternal malediction. (De Pecc. Orig. thes. 4.)

The efficient cause is Adam and Eve, our first parents; for since Adam was constituted by God the instrumental principle in nature, of the whole human race, and indeed a voluntary instrument, it is necessary to suppose that this evil was effected by God, by nature, or by this particular instrument: Not by God, who left the voluntary instrument to pursue his own course, and taught him what was right; not from nature, which is the subject of the voluntary instrument, but does not govern it; then it must proceed from the instrumental principle. (ib. thes. 6.)

God, as in the order of his creation, placed the whole human race in Adam, by nature; so in the dispensation of his righteousness, he said to the whole human race in Adam, *IN WHOM* we have sinned, *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die.* (ib. thes. 7.)

They who pronounce that sin to be simply involuntary, are very much deceived, since the same thing may be said to be voluntary and involuntary in different respects, whether you respect its generation, or its constitution; for the whole race was voluntary in sinning in Adam, (although in respect to its particular origin, it was to us involuntary,) in whom we have a common origin, and as it proceeds from the fault of our nature, it is voluntary, though not by a particular act of the will of each individual. (ib. thes. 8.)

Hence it comes to pass, (namely, by the transgression of Adam,) that all of us who are born, bear the stigma and brand of our rebellion; so that before we enjoy the light, we partake of the injury of our origin. For, indeed, we all sinned in him, in whom we *ALL* were *ONE MAN*. (ib. thes. 2.)

Our nature was deprived of the gift of righteousness in Adam; and the nature of Adam having become destitute, makes all persons procreated from it, subject to the same destitution, sinners and unrighteous; and so the personal sin of Adam has passed upon all, who according to nature are personally propagated from him. (ib. thes. 8.)

Εφ' ᾧ should be interpreted *IN WHOM*, namely, Adam. In this chapter, the apostle openly declares that all have sinned in Adam; that by the fall of one, Adam, many are become dead; that *GUILT* is from one offence to condemnation: by one offence death reigned; by one man—by one offence guilt came upon all men to condemnation—and finally, by the disobedience of one man many were constituted sinners. (de Nat. and Grat. rat. 71.)

Peter Molinæus, Professor at Sedan.

In this argument the declaration of the apostle is most express, where he says, "by one man, &c." Yea, infants he subjects in a peculiar manner to this necessity, saying, "*death reigned over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression,*" that is, who had not sinned actually, but only originally. And lest any should refer this to imputation alone, in the 7th chapter he confesses his own proclivity to sinning. (Molinæus denies, indeed, that imputation is ALONE, but acknowledges and proves, that this is joined with corruption, which the Synod also does.) "We," says he, "sinned in Adam, and in him willed this depravation."

"Nor indeed would God impute the sin of Adam to his posterity, unless they had in themselves something which was truly of the nature of sin, and unless they were evil by nature."

It is evident that he acknowledges imputation, with inherent depravity conjoined; but in his ANATOMY of ARMINIANISM, he asserts the doctrine of imputation, professedly, and spends one whole chapter in its defence.

Daniel Chamier, Professor of Theology, at Montauban.

After bringing forward the various opinions of the Papists, he reduces them all to two. First, those of the Catholics, who agree with the Reformed, on this point. 2. Those who acknowledge nothing inherent, which can be called sin. In the first class he places Bellarmine, Peltanus, Delphinus, Alvarius, Vasquez, &c. Against these he alleges nothing which need be made a subject of controversy. He then proceeds to dispute against those who made original sin to consist altogether in the imputation of the first sin; but his arguments do not strike those, such as Bellarmine, who join depravity proceeding from the first man, to the imputation of his sin.

"For Bellarmine," says he, "considers in sin, the act itself, and that which from the act *formally* remains in the soul; and these two things may be distinguished, as heat, and causing heat. In Adam both really existed; in us, not the act of Adam, except by imputation, but the quality from the act really. Wherefore, in the first sense, original sin is the first transgression of Adam, committed by him, as representing the whole human race, in whom all sinned. But in

the second sense, it is the destitution of original righteousness, with an habitual aversion to God, and perverseness of will, resulting in a peculiar manner from the actual disobedience of the first parent." (Panstratrae Fam. iii. lib. 1. c. 2. sec. 9.)

"We grant that by the disobedience of Adam all were truly, and in fact rendered unrighteous, by inherent depravity; but that the unrighteousness of Adam was NOT IMPUTED, we declare to be false. On the contrary, we deny that we could be made inherently unrighteous, by one man, *unless the unrighteousness of this one man were imputed to us*. Wherefore it is false THAT THE DISOBEDIENCE OF ADAM WAS NOT IMPUTED TO US." (ib. lib. 21. chap. 2. sec. 9.)

Again, "We grant that the disobedience of Adam, and the obedience of Christ do efficiently and meritoriously constitute us unrighteous and righteous; for this we never denied; for we deny that they could render us righteous or unrighteous, UNLESS THEY WERE FIRST IMPUTED, for if not imputed, in no way are they ours; for they are the acts of individuals, and therefore personal. But for personal acts to be common to others, is absurd and contradictory. Therefore, it behoves, that THEY SHOULD BE IMPUTED. For this kind of communication is no how inconsistent with the proper personality of acts; it proceeds on an entirely different principle. Therefore the very sin of Adam, I say his own personal disobedience, MUST BE IMPUTED TO HIS POSTERITY. And so also, in regard to the obedience of Christ: because the whole human race was considered as in Adam by nature; and because the whole multitude of believers were in Christ, by grace. Hence it comes to pass, that we are not only made sinners by Adam, but are declared to HAVE SINNED IN HIM, which is a very different thing."

I say then that it is certain that all men are *really* constituted unrighteous by Adam, and that all believers are *really* constituted righteous by Christ. But I deny that that is the point which the apostle had under consideration; for his inquiry here, is into the grounds of our condemnation and justification; for although he considers *κατὰ κριμα* as in Adam, yet not peculiar to him, but pertaining to the whole human race; for the meaning is, then when Adam sinned, the whole human race was condemned, or made GUILTY of disobedience to God; whence also this by Augustine was called original sin, the punishment of the first sin; but how could it be punishment, unless that very first sin were imputed?

John Mistrezatius, Pastor of the Church at Paris.

It is necessary that that which is past should become ours by imputation only, but that which resides in another, should be derived to us by inheritance. For as Cardinal Bellarmine very well says, concerning the act of sin committed by Adam: "It is communicated to us in the only way in which a thing past can be, namely, BY IMPUTATION." So the obedience of the Second Adam, as it has been past now more than sixteen hundred years, is communicated to us by imputation. But in regard to his spirit, it flows into us by regeneration, just as the inherent corruption of Adam is derived to us by natural generation. (*Hæc Ille*, p. 37.)

If the doctors of the Roman church agree that the disobedience of Adam is imputed to us, because he was considered the Head of his posterity, with what reason can they deny that the obedience of the Second Adam is imputed to us? But you will say, the corruption of Adam has descended to us really, and inheres in us. So it does; but I say that the imputation of his disobedience precedes, and corruption is derived to us by generation, because we sinned in Adam, as in our Head; God abandoning the posterity of Adam to the corruption of their father, on account of his sin. (*ib.* p. 43.)

Charles Drelincourt, Pastor of the Church at Paris.

As the sin of Adam is imputed to us, because we all sinned in Adam, so, in like manner, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, since in the person of Christ, our Head, we have fulfilled all righteousness. (*On Rom. v. 19.*)

John Scharp Sestus, S. T. Professor.

Original sin is two-fold, imputed and inherent. Imputed sin is the defection of Adam, which imputed to all his posterity, that were in his loins; which sin was actually in Adam, but only in us by imputation. It is imputed to us because we were in Adam, as in our root and stock. (*Theol. Comm. Loc. xi. De Peccato.*)

Again, concerning justification:—

It is objected, that it is absurd to say, that any one can be righteous, with a righteousness without him; for this would be the same as if I should say, that the wall is white by the whiteness which is not its own. To which I answer: In things strictly of a personal nature, no one can be denominated, except the person in whom the thing exists; but in regard

to the righteousness of Christ it is otherwise, because it is not personally peculiar to Christ, but by the covenant of grace, is communicated to all believers; for as the sin of Adam was not personal, but imputed to every individual of the whole human race; so also the righteousness of Christ.

John Dartesius.

By one man, namely Adam, sin entered into the world, by imputation and propagation: therefore, in the same manner the thing takes place with us, in regard to the righteousness of Christ. (*Clavis Predestinationis*, part 1. c. 5.)

John Crayus Oecitanus, Pastor.

Adam was a public person, representing the whole of his posterity, and he sinned not only for himself, but for all men descending from him. As the descendants who were yet to descend from Abraham, paid tithes in the person of their father, who afterwards received tithes from their brethren, as the apostle teaches us, Heb. vii. 7—9, so also men, who by natural generation from Adam have their descent, become guilty, and are condemned to undergo punishment, on account of the action of their parent, in whose loins they at the time existed: for his fall was the fall of the whole human race, who in the loss sustained by their first parent, lost all their riches, with which it behoved them to be endowed. "By one offence many were constituted sinners." Rom. v. 19. [From these things the imputation of the first sin may manifestly be inferred.] (On the 10th article of the Confession of the Gallican Church.)

There is no Christian who does not confess that the rebellion of Adam was imputed to his posterity, but if any one can be found bold enough to make such a denial, he will be compelled to acknowledge it from the words of Paul. For truly guilt could not come upon all men to condemnation by one sin, unless by the imputation of that sin. And death could not have reigned over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, unless by the imputation of the sin of our first parent. (On the 18th article of the Confession.)

John Chenet, V. D. M.

Although actually, and in very fact, we did not eat the forbidden fruit, as did Adam, nevertheless we all sinned in Adam, Rom. v. 12. And, as Augustin teaches, *Epist.* 23. to

Boniface, we consequently contracted from him, an obligation to punishment, since we were one with Adam when he sinned. (Exam. of the Principal art. of Religion, Lib. 11. c. 28.)

Original sin is the imputation of the transgression of Adam, and then a real vitiosity as well of body as mind, which we have received from Adam.

Quest. Why do you extend this sin to the imputation of the transgression of Adam?

Ans. Because as we are not otherwise reformed and regenerated by the Holy Spirit, but as we are pardoned and justified by the gratuitous imputation of the merit of Christ: so original sin does not consist merely in that depravity which is the opposite of that renovation which is by the Holy Spirit, but also in the imputation of the sin of Adam, which is the opposite to the payment made by Christ, and to his perfect obedience for us, even to the death of the cross. (ib. chap. 21.)

Abraham Colignon, V. D. M.

Quest. Why, on account of the sin of Adam, do all his posterity lie in a state of misery?

Ans. Because Adam represented the whole human race: for, as the promises of good made to him would not only have been fulfilled to him, but to his posterity, if he had continued in obedience; so in like manner the threatenings of evil came upon them as well as on him. (Institutes of the Principal Articles of Faith, sec. iii.)

Paul Ferrius, Pastor.

All we were in the loins of Adam, and sinned in him, and with him. (Orthodox. Specimina.)

Daniel Tilenus, Prof. Sedan. Disp. xv.

Original sin is that hereditary corruption of human nature, by which all who by natural generation are propagated from Adam, are infected; and so in the loins of this first parent, *they sinned together with him*, and incurred the guilt of both temporal and eternal punishment.

William Whitaker, Doctor and Professor of Theology, in the University of Cambridge.

[Wm. Whitaker wrote a particular tract on Original Sin,

against Stapleton, and other papists; in the first book of which he treats of the first sin of Adam.]

"Although," says he "that act was of Adam alone, nor could inhere in his posterity, or in Adam himself, yet BY IMPUTATION it is the act of all of us. But does the word IMPUTATION, in this case, give offence? Then hear what LYRA, on the 5th chap. of the Romans says, 'The sin of Adam is imputed to all descending from him, according to the law of generation; for they are his members, whence this is called *original sin*.' But if you think that this testimony is out of date, I will refer you to two of the firmest pillars of the Roman Church, Cajetan and Bellarmine. Cajetan, on this passage, says, 'The punishment of death on account of it, is inflicted on all his posterity; and it is proved that the sin is imputed to him and all his posterity, because the punishment of it is endured by them all.' (So Bellarmine, Tom. iii. lib. v. c. 17.) 'Adam alone committed that by his actual volition; but it is communicated to us by generation, in the only way in which it can be transmitted, namely, by imputation.'

Original sin is inherent and native depravity, but the actual and free transgression of Adam is imputed to us. For we should neither be held under the guilt or depravity thence contracted, unless that act by which Adam violated the divine precept was ascribed to us by IMPUTATION. But in regard, that some scholastic theologians place original sin in imputation ALONE; in this they basely and nefariously err.

John Junius, preacher at Delft.

In the sum of the matter, ALL the Reformed churches agree, and teach with unanimous consent, in accordance with the sacred scriptures, and the universal agreement of antiquity; first, that the sin of Adam was not a personal sin, but of the whole human race, inasmuch as they were all included in the loins of Adam, and in Adam, the first parent of us all, and root of the whole human race, they sinned. Secondly, there was transfused a principle contrary to original righteousness, contracted from Adam in the first transient act of his sin, and propagated by means of generation, to all his posterity; so that all men, by nature, are guilty of death, and averse from the love which they owe to God and divine things, and turned or inclined to evil. (Antapologia Posthuma. ch. vii. p. 152.)

G. S. Frisius.

Nor is it merely the *IMPUTATION* of the sin of another, as if all, on account of the first sin of their parents, were only made obnoxious to death; as if this evil would not have the nature of their own proper sin, unless their consent was added; but it is the real sin of the whole human race, through the fall of Adam, *IN WHOM* all have sinned, Rom. v. 12. and are all, by nature, under an obligation, from the just judgment of God, to endure the punishment of eternal death.

Again, as from the merit of Christ, a double benefit is decreed to us, the imputation of gratuitous righteousness, and the regeneration of our corrupt nature, so a double evil has been transmitted to us from the sin of Adam, namely, *GUILT*, on account of the sin committed by him and *IN HIM*. (Rom. v. 12,) and the depravation of nature, propagated from him to us. The individual person of Adam is not here considered, but the nature common to all his posterity, in respect to which all are propagated from him corrupt, as being members of the one same nature. (*De peccato originali.*)

John G. Vossius.

There are two questions; whether the sin of our first parent was imputed to all their posterity; and how far imputed. The Catholic church has once judged, that that first sin is imputed to all; that is, by the just judgment of God, all its effects are transmitted to all the children of Adam; but these effects were believed to be, that we are born destitute of original righteousness, subject to the necessity of death, and liable to an eternal separation from God. (The above he confirms by many testimonies from the sacred scriptures, and from the ancients.) (*Hist. Pol. Lib. ii. p. 1.*)

J. Laurentius.

The true and genuine exposition of these words is, that all men sinned in Adam, as in their common stock and mass, and so in him and by him. It is altogether a different thing to sin in Adam, and to derive sin from him. And we should carefully distinguish the sin which all committed in Adam, from original sin; namely, as the cause from the effect. For all sinned in Adam, at the time that he sinned by eating the forbidden fruit, as then naturally existing in his loins. This first sin of Adam is the cause of original sin, which is the effect; therefore, it is falsely asserted by Catharinus and Pighius, "That original sin is nothing else but this first sin."

Again, Augustine in his 39th Epist. speaks of both these kinds of sin, but distinguishes them; as also in several parts of his works. (In Epist. ad Rom. C. V. v. 12.)

Nic. Vedelius, Professor of Theology in the University of Franequer.

The reason why God imputes the sin of Adam to his posterity, is his justice, and not mere will, as the Arminians teach.

The imputation of the first sin, is such, that, in fact, the whole posterity of Adam is made liable to eternal condemnation, contrary to what the Arminians hold. (Theod. Disp. 20. Thes. 5 and 6.)

S. Lubbertus, S. Theology, Dr. and Professor at Franequer, and a member of the Synod at Dort.

When Faustus Socinus, the Photinian, that he might invalidate the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, in his work *De Christo Salvatore*, Lib. iv. c. 4, had objected to Covetus and others of the orthodox, that we thus conclude, "That as by the crime and disobedience of Adam, men are condemned and dead, because that crime and disobedience were imputed to them; so by the righteousness and obedience of Christ they are absolved and live, because that righteousness and obedience are imputed to them. To which Socinus answered, that it was false that the crime and disobedience of Adam were imputed." At these words, Lubbert wrote in the margin, that we cannot be guilty of the sin of another, unless that sin is imputed to us.

But in his answer, he uses the following arguments: It is agreed between us and our opponent, that we are constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam, and are constituted righteous by the obedience of Christ; the only question is respecting the mode in which this takes place. How are we constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam? and how are we constituted righteous by the obedience of Christ? We say, that in both cases the effect takes place by imputation.

For by the sin of Adam imputed to us, we are constituted guilty. When the apostle says, that all have sinned in Adam, he means, that the sin of Adam, as our head, was imputed to us when we were yet in his loins, and on that account we are reckoned guilty: and at the same time, it is the will of God, that as Adam, by his transgression, was rendered averse to God, that is, corrupt and depraved, so we by the same

transgression imputed to us, as I said, are born averse to God, corrupt and depraved. Therefore the sin of Adam is imputed to us, and that corruption and depravity in which we are born, we call original sin.

When Adam, by his total apostacy from God, became guilty of death, all his posterity were implicated in the same guilt; no otherwise than if they had all sinned against God, by perpetrating the crime of murder.

It is manifest, therefore, that the same guilt is **IMPUTED**; or which is the same thing, the same crime by which **GUILT** was contracted.

John Maccovius, Professor in the University of Franequer, and also a member of the synod of Dort.

It is called original sin, because man derives it from his first origin, and it is imputed, or inherent. The imputed sin of our origin, is the defection, or first transgression of Adam and Eve, committed by eating the forbidden fruit; and afterwards **IMPUTED** to the whole human race, naturally propagated from these two persons. (Loc. Com. Disp. xiv.)

John C. Emdan, of the same University.

Concerning all the posterity of Adam, we affirm, that as well on account of the fall of Adam, as by their own proper sins, they are cast into a state of misery, in this, following the Scriptures, which teach, that the first origin of death was from Adam; so that in truth his posterity are reckoned to have sinned in him, and so, on account of the sin of Adam, which he committed by eating the forbidden fruit, not as if this sin was altogether another's, but as being in some sort their own, they are adjudged to death. (Rom. v. 12.)

Agreeably to the Scriptures it is said, that all who are born of Adam, sinned in his loins, because it was so appointed by God, that that sin which Adam first committed, should not be reckoned only the sin of Adam, but should be **IMPUTED** to his posterity.

The meaning of the Scripture is evident, since it pronounces, that men are constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam, for it clearly teaches, that men are so constituted sinners by the sin of Adam, that according to the divine ordination, sin is imputed to his posterity; and on this account

they are equally reckoned sinners, as if in their own proper person they had committed it. (*Idea Theologica.*)

Thomas Strackius.

As Martin Becan, the Jesuit, in his book concerning God, says 'That by original sin, these two things are understood: 1. The actual sin of Adam, by which he destroyed himself and the whole human race. 2. Habitual sin, which is contracted by his posterity, from the actual sin of Adam; that is the corruption and vitiosity of human nature; hence that sin is truly described to be an actual defection of the descendants of Adam, who, while in his loins, made a defection from God to the devil. And this corruption or vitiosity of nature, is inflicted on man, by God, as a just judge, on account of the aforesaid defection, by both of which man is rendered miserable, and made obnoxious to eternal damnation, until by Christ he is liberated from that misery. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, v. 12, speaks concerning this first sin. (*Vindication of the Catechism of the Palatinate, Quest. VII.*)

James Arminius, Professor in the University of Leyden.

Since the condition of the covenant first entered into by God with the first man, was, that if they would remain in his favour and grace, by the observance of this precept, and others, the gifts conferred on him, with the same grace, would be transmitted to his posterity; but if they, (our first parents,) should render themselves unworthy of these blessings, by their disobedience, their posterity also should be destitute of them, and should be obnoxious to the contrary evils: hence it has happened, that all men naturally propagated from them should be subjected to death, temporal and eternal, and should be destitute of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and of original righteousness: which punishment, the privation of the image of God, is wont to be called original sin. *From these things, the imputation of the sin of our first parents is necessarily inferred; for wherever there is the punishment of sin, there is the imputation of the same.* (*Disp. 31. Thes. 9.*)

Neustadian admonition of the Professors of the Palatinate.

We acknowledge original sin to be, not only guilt, but the hereditary depravity of human nature, which is repugnant to the law of God, and deserving eternal punishment.

Hieronymus Zanchius, Professor of Theology.

Because the whole human race, which is propagated by natural generation from Adam, were in his loins, hence the precept, with its penalty, was not addressed to the person of Adam alone, but also pertained to the whole human race. Therefore, we believe and confess with the apostle, that in Adam sinning, all men sinned: so that that disobedience was not peculiar to Adam, but was the common [disobedience] of the whole human race; since his guilt has involved all men, naturally descended from his loins, as the apostle Paul, to the Romans hath manifestly taught. And as an antithesis to the disobedience of Adam, he has firmly established the obedience of Christ. For if the obedience of Christ is no less ours by imputation, than Christ's by his own proper action, because we are born again by his incorruptible seed, and from his spirit; it follows, that the disobedience of Adam also IS IMPUTED TO US, and we are held by his guilt, who have been born from his corrupt seed, who is the father of us all.

That sin which by the first man entered into the world, was not only the privation of original righteousness, and the total corruption of human nature, but also the disobedience of Adam itself, which was not ours in the act, nevertheless, in its fault and guilt, has come upon us by IMPUTATION. And by way of explication, he says, We therefore say that that disobedience of Adam, which was not ours in act, yet as to the fault and guilt, became ours BY IMPUTATION; since God most justly imputes that sin of Adam, as being the *head*, to us the members. (Treatise on Redemption. Thes. I.)

For this is the reason why all men have sinned in Adam, that is, were made guilty, because Adam first sinned by his own actual disobedience; so we also in him as in our origin, are made guilty; and his sin becomes ours BY IMPUTATION. Thus also the apostle expresses it, when he says, "By the disobedience of one, namely, Adam, we are **all** constituted sinners. This is our *ανομία*, the imputation of Adam's sin, which has become ours because we are his members. And this is the principal thing in original sin."

Zachariah Ursinus.

Original sin is the guilt of the whole human race, on account of the fall of our first parents, and the privation of the knowledge of God, &c. Two things are included

in it: the guilt of eternal damnation, on account of the sin of our first parents. 2. The depravation of our whole nature since the fall. Concerning both these, Paul speaks, Rom. v. 12: By one man &c. Some, while they admit that we are guilty in consequence of this first sin, deny that there is in all an innate depravity which deserves damnation and wrath. For they allege, that the concupiscence in which we are born, cannot be of the nature of sin.

Against such, it must be held, first, that the whole human race is guilty of the eternal wrath of God, on account of the disobedience of our first parents; unless they are delivered from this guilt, by the grace of the Mediator.

Secondly, there is in us, besides this guilt, a defect, and inclinations contrary to the law of God, as soon as we are born. These defects and evil inclinations are sins deserving the eternal wrath of God.

Paul clearly teaches, that by one man's disobedience, we were all rendered guilty, and made obnoxious to damnation. And he compares this condemnation of all, on account of the sin of one, to the justification of many, on account of the satisfaction of one. As then, by Christ, there is a two-fold grace, namely, *THE IMPUTATION* of righteousness, and the regeneration or restoration of corrupt nature, so also the evil flowing from the sin of Adam is double; first, *GUILT*, on account of the sin committed by him, and depravity of nature, contracted from him and propagated to us. (Explic. of the Catechism. Par. I. Quest. 7.)

George Sohnius, the colleague of Ursinus at Heidelberg.

Original sin, as well in Adam as in his posterity, includes three deadly evils, the demerit, the guilt or liableness to punishment, and the depravity or corruption of nature. All these concur in the parent, and in his posterity, in relation to the first sin, with this difference only, that Adam sinning was the principal agent committing the fault, deserving the guilt, and casting off the image of God, and rendering himself depraved. Of all these do his posterity partake, by *IMPUTATION*, and by generation from a corrupted parent. Then it is in vain disputed by the sophists, whether the demerit, the guilt, or the depravity is contracted by the fall: for all these do actually exist; so that taking the words in a wide sense, you may say, that the fall and disobedience of our first parents, and in them of the whole human race, by which all of them, in like manner, lost the image of God, depraved their

nature, became the enemies of God, and contracted the guilt of temporal and eternal death; unless deliverance and reconciliation should take place by the Son of God, the Mediator.

Again, "All are dead by the offence of one man:" therefore his offence was the offence of all: but theirs by participation and IMPUTATION, otherwise they could not be said to be dead by the offence of one, but by many offences.

Although it is truly said that the first sin was committed by Adam; yet not as a single person, but as the father of the whole human race; however it is not correct to say that original sin existed in Adam, or that Adam had original sin, for then the cause and effect, actual and original sin, would be manifestly confounded. The first sin of Adam, therefore, as we said before, must be viewed in a double aspect. In one respect, it was the sin of Adam, and was not original sin, but actual, *originating*, that is giving origin to the original sin of his posterity: in another respect it was the sin of his posterity, who were in his loins; so that in mass they committed the same sin, and hence IT IS IMPUTED TO THEM ALL. Thus this our fall pertains to our original sin.

Bellarmino's first proposition is, "*that the first transgression of Adam, which is the transgression of the whole human race, is original sin, if by sin be meant an action.*" This is correct, if it only be added, If sin be taken for an action not of Adam alone, but of his posterity, who, *in mass*, sinned in Adam. For thus this action was ours, pertaining in the first place to our original sin.

We close here our extracts from these witnesses to the doctrine of imputation, as held by the Reformers. The careful reader cannot but be struck by the distinctness and uniformity of their views. At this time, when the doctrine itself is perverted, and the opinions of the Reformers and others shamefully misrepresented, we should be glad to see the whole collection of testimony made by Viret, translated, and published in a volume.

ART. VII.—*Moral Machinery Simplified. A Discourse delivered at Andover, Massachusetts, July 4th, 1839.* By Parsons Cooke, Pastor of the First Church in Lynn. 8vo. pp. 40. Andover, William Pearce, 1839.

THIS is a publication small in bulk, but on a very important subject. It is the work of an enlightened and vigorous

mind, and shows that the author has bestowed much unshackled thought on the topic which he undertook to discuss: and although we do not agree with him in every thing, we rejoice that he has made the publication, and we consider the religious public as under obligation to him for the free and able manner in which he has executed his task. We rejoice especially that such a work has come from New England, and from one of her ablest writers and divines, because we believe they have been heretofore slow to receive the doctrine of Mr. Cooke, and because their ecclesiastical order is such, that they have peculiar inducements to employ voluntary associations in carrying on their works of benevolent enterprize.

Mr. Cooke does not declare war against *all* voluntary associations. He distinguishes them into two classes. The one class he calls *benevolent societies*; and the other he denominates *public opinion societies*. The former he considers as approvable and safe; the latter he condemns, as unscriptural, unwise, and mischievous. We concur with him in not proscribing every form of voluntary association. We think they may, in some cases, be made to promote the best interests both of the church and the world. But we should not be quite willing to adopt the precise line of demarcation between those which are safe, and those which are otherwise, which has been drawn by our eloquent author. For example, we are by no means prepared, on the one hand, to denounce all *public opinion societies*. If it should again become desirable, as it was on the approach, and during the continuance of the revolutionary war, for every good citizen to deny himself the use of all imported manufactures, and other foreign luxuries, we can see no good reason why every true patriot should not, in such a case, unite in trying to effect such an impression on the public mind, as to form a "non importation agreement." Or, if the fashion of extravagant expenditure at funerals, or other special occasions, should gain ground in any community, to a very inconvenient and mischievous degree, where would be the harm of forming voluntary associations for effecting a popular agreement to abandon the evil? We have no doubt, indeed, that many "public opinion societies" are deeply injurious to the best interests of the community, and that Mr. Cooke does not go too far in holding them up to public reprobation. But we have quite as little doubt that exigences may arise, in which there is no other method of obviating prevalent evils, either so safe or so

effectual, as by associating, to produce a salutary change in popular feeling and habit.

On the other hand, some of the voluntary societies which Mr. Cooke denominates *benevolent*, and of which he expresses his approbation, we feel constrained entirely to disapprove and oppose. The following short extract will serve to show Mr. Cooke's views of such societies, and will open the way for showing wherein we differ from him.

"I cannot agree with those who wholly exclude the voluntary principle of association in the cause of benevolence. When the object of the association is to feed the hungry, or to supply the spiritual wants of the destitute, and where large outlays are contemplated, requiring the co-operation of large bodies of men, I see no objection to the principle. Some would contend, that in such cases, the funds should be gathered and expended by the constituted authorities of the church. And that those denominations whose theory makes all the individual churches in their communion, but so many subordinate branches of one church, can conduct their benevolent enterprizes more efficiently, and more for their denominational interests, without separate organizations, and under the hand of the constituted authorities of the church, is what we, as Congregationalists, are not interested to affirm or deny. For Congregationalism, making each individual church essentially independent of the rest, and having no constituted authorities above the single church, has no hands to conduct benevolent enterprizes, on a large scale, but what is created by voluntary combination. All our associations larger than a church, united for any purpose, are, by the necessity of the case, voluntary associations. If, for instance, we were to conduct the work of foreign missions, by a society composed of a delegation from all the churches that contribute to the funds, or by such bodies as the General Association of Massachusetts, the work would then not be conducted by ecclesiastical authority. For Congregationalists know no permanent authorities besides a single church, and the great Head of the Church. The General Association is only a voluntary society, disclaiming all authority; and the Consociation admitted by some Congregationalists, is a departure from the principles of Congregationalists, and is but another name for a presbytery. Congregationalism, then, does not admit of our conducting benevolent enterprizes on any other than the voluntary principle."

We thank Mr. Cook for the admission which this paragraph contains; and we hope that those who live a few years longer, will see his acute and powerful mind yielding to the clearness and force of the argument which his own concession furnishes, and declaring in favor of Presbyterianism. It is indeed true that the church can in no way pursue her benevolent enterprizes upon strictly ecclesiastical principles, but by means of the Presbyterian, or some equivalent organization; and there is absolutely no other that is so convenient and efficient. Had the churches of Massachusetts possessed this bond of union and authority, and employed it with fidelity, the growth of Unitarianism within their borders, would have been nipped in the bud, and that state would have been as free from this fatal poison, as her sister, Connecticut, where, as Mr. C. justly remarks, a superior and authoritative power, similar to that of Presbytery, really exists, under another name; and where the authority of consociated churches has been actually and effectually exercised, for expelling the Unitarian views from their ecclesiastical bounds. There never was a form of church government so well adapted to combine freedom with vigour; the most ample consultation of the rights and wishes of the people, with the purity, homogeneousness, order and edification of the whole body; and at the same time, to enable the whole to act with concentrated power and effect, as the Presbyterian. If any should attempt to refute this, by referring us to the troubles which have occasionally arisen in Presbyterian churches; we may effectually stop their mouths, by pointing them to the far worse troubles which have arisen, times without number, in Episcopal churches; and to the still more tremendous schisms, and profligate disorders which disgraced and distracted the monarchical church of Rome, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, to say nothing of other strifes and divisions almost innumerable, both before and after that period.

We have already intimated that we cannot agree with our respected author, in approving voluntary associations for all sorts, even of "benevolent" enterprizes. Some of them we entirely approve, and would recommend with all our hearts. The Bible Society, the Tract Society, the Society for Colonizing, with their own consent, the free children of Africa on their own shores;—all these we approve, and would zealously help forward to the utmost extent of our power. As long as the first named society devotes itself to the

circulation of the Holy Bible “without note or comment;” the *second*, to supplying the whole world with such tracts and bound volumes as it has hitherto sent abroad; and the *third*, to its professed legitimate objects, who can fear them? Does membership in any of these societies, call upon any man to compromit his principles? Does it alter the character of the donation, whether the dollar with which two Bibles are purchased and sent forth, came from the pocket of a sound Calvinist, or a miserable Atheist? The truth is, the more vigorously and successfully these societies prosecute their respective objects, as long as they faithfully adhere to their respective constitutions, the better is it both for the church and the world. It is impossible for them to do any thing but good without deviating from their professed plans of operation.

But other voluntary societies of the “benevolent” class, are not, in our estimation, so unexceptionable. If we understand Mr. Cooke, he would rejoice to see missionary plans and efforts, and the education of pious youth for the gospel ministry, conducted by voluntary societies. In regard to this matter, we are constrained totally to differ from him. We do not, indeed, undertake to legislate for our Congregational brethren. As they have no other possible method of pursuing these important objects, than by resorting to the principle of voluntary association, we cannot, of course, blame them for adopting the best, nay the only means in their power. But, for the Presbyterian Church—nay, so far as we can see, for any church, to commit the work of Christian missions;—the work of organizing churches, and planting ministers; and the work of selecting and training young men for her ministry—to hands without her pale, and irresponsible to her authorities, is, of all mistakes, one of the most egregious and perilous. In fact, we may, with emphatic truth, apply to such societies, the maxim of Archimedes:—Give them but a stand on which to place their lever, and they may heave the world. Allow a body of men out of a church to plant her congregations,—to locate her pastors,—and to select and educate her candidates for the sacred office, and thus, to a great extent, to form their character; and it requires no prophetic discernment to foretel that she must, in a little while, be wholly subjected to their power.

We do not deny that voluntary and irresponsible associations, simply for raising funds to enable the church to carry on her missionary and education plans—but leaving her, in

her own character, and by her own proper officers to execute her own plans, may be both safe and desirable. But when we commit to such hands the delicate and momentous work of selecting, training and sending forth her teachers and rulers themselves, and thus arranging, directly or indirectly, her ecclesiastical affairs, any child may foresee that we are consigning her to probable and not very distant subjugation to these hands, and, of course, to the risk of inevitable ruin.

But while we are compelled thus seriously to differ from Mr. Cooke, in regard to some of his opinions, we hail the appearance of this pamphlet with pleasure. It is seasonable, and, we doubt not, will be useful. It marks an era in the return of the public mind to just views of the subject of which it treats.

When the intelligence, the enterprize, and the public spirit of New England shall receive a happy direction in respect to this matter, we may anticipate that uniformity and tranquillity of feeling throughout our great American family, which will prepare the "watchmen on the walls of Zion," as to all main points, to "see eye to eye;" and enable them, as far as their different circumstances will admit, to co-operate for enlightening and converting the world.

We will only add, that while we think Mr. C. has done well in what he has said in regard to voluntary associations, we are persuaded much remains to be said and learned concerning a subject which the events of the last twenty or thirty years have invested with great importance. Sound principles on this subject, will not, probably, become again popular, but after much experience, much calm discussion, and very gradual approaches. We feel persuaded, however, that when enlightened practical wisdom shall resume her sway in this matter, she will decide, to the satisfaction of every impartial inquirer, that whatever else may be safely managed by voluntary associations, it will ever be unsafe to commit to them the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs; in other words, that every thing bearing on the training and investiture of the Christian ministry, and sending forth the ambassadors of Christ to their hallowed work, can be conducted wisely and safely only by the church herself.

ART. VIII.—*Obligations of the World to the Bible: A Series of Lectures to Young Men.* By Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, in the city of New York. New York, Taylor and Dodd. 1839. pp. 404. 8vo.

It is needless to repeat what was said a few months ago, concerning the respected author of this work, and his former production. The beautiful volume now before us contains matter of even higher quality, more rich in argument and eloquence, and having abundantly greater marks of research. Few subjects of greater importance could be set before American young men; and it was with delight that we heard, while these lectures were in the course of delivery, that the interest was kept up for three months, in assemblies uniformly full and attentive: showing, we think, that the most solid kind of religious discourse may be made permanently attractive, even in our day of hurry and false-zeal.

The Bible is here considered “in its influence upon oral and written language—upon history and literature—upon laws and government—upon civil and religious liberty—upon the social institutions—upon moral science and the moral virtues—upon the holiness which fits men for heaven, and the peculiar spirit and exalted character which prepares them to act well their part on the earth—upon the happiness they enjoy in the present world—upon the agency and power by which these desirable results are secured.” Some of these topics lead the writer into trains of inquiry and argument which are quite recondite, and which evince a marked interest in the connexions of religion with literature and science. This is particularly true of the opening lecture, in which the idea is presented and expanded, that the origin of letters is to be sought among the scenes of Scripture history. Each of these lectures is a separate argument, and we are therefore unable to go into that sort of analysis which is common in Reviews, but must touch here and there on what may strike us, in the hope that we may invite many of our readers to the book itself. The lecture on the literary merit of the Bible, is tasteful and popular. Those upon the relations of the Bible to legislation, liberty, the rights of conscience, and slavery, are interesting in a high degree, and contain many views of the subject which are seldom brought before the religious public. The single argument upon the

Mosaic code displays a close examination of the subject which has been rewarded by rich results, and which will repay every reader for the expense of the volume.

Upon the morality of the Bible, Dr. Spring expresses opinions that strike at the root of many of the heresies of our day: his views are the more welcome, and will be the more influential, as coming from a true son of the ancient divines of New-England.

"Are there not," he asks, "some systems of ethical philosophy which are not found either among pagans, or infidels that are far below the spirit of the Bible? What is the morality, the foundation of which is simply what is useful and expedient; the standard of which is the spirit and maxims of this world; and the motives of which are purely mercenary and selfish? Can that be called morality, which recognizes no immutable distinction between what is right and what is wrong; which has no reference to the obligations of the divine law; and is concerned only with our own interests? Can that be called morality which asks, not what is right, but what is profitable? which enquires not for duty, but for interest, for the opinions of men, for the spirit of the age? Such a morality is most certainly radically defective. It is the morality of the world, not of the Bible. It is a mere external morality. It has no thorough lodgment, no permanent abode in the hidden chambers of the soul. It is a superficial observance. It is what all morality must be, separated from the truth of the Scriptures;—a body without a soul—a whited sepulchre—splendid only in sepulchral magnificence.

"The morality of the Bible is well and intelligibly defined. Its foundation, its standard, its motives are distinctly set before us, and ought not to be misunderstood. Why then is any being in the universe under obligations to be morally virtuous? Why is the Divine Being bound to be holy, unless because holiness is right, and he is capable of perceiving it to be so? And why are intelligent creatures bound to be morally virtuous, unless because they are so made as to be able to perceive, and feel under obligation to approve and practise, moral virtue? 'Be ye *holy*, for I the Lord your God am *holy*.' If the Divine Being were malevolent, or selfish, would that circumstance bind us to be so too? The *moral excellence* of the divine character is a good and sufficient reason why men should be morally excellent. God requires them to be *holy*, because he is *holy*. The character that is right in God, is right in creatures. It is in its own

nature just what it ought to be. The Deity would not be satisfied with himself without possessing such a character; nor would virtuous and holy minds be satisfied with him, if he were not thus perfectly amiable and excellent. God is love; God is truth; God is rectitude; God is mercy; God is justice. There is a wide and immutable difference between such a character and the opposite. The former is right, and the latter is wrong. Nothing can reconcile them. There is not, nor can there be any gradual approximation of them to one another. They are perfect opposites, and so will always remain. It would not be right for God to possess any other character than that which he does possess; and no considerations of profit and loss, no considerations of the probable tendency of any other character, can ever induce him to change, or modify it; nor were it possible to do so, except for the worse. The foundation of moral obligation therefore lies in the immutable difference between what is right and what is wrong, and in the capacity of intelligent beings to perceive that difference. I say in the *capacity* to perceive that difference; for in a fallen creature especially, that difference may not always be perceived, while the obligation to perceive it remains unimpaired. When we look at our own natures, and the natures of our fellow men; when we contemplate the relations we sustain to them and they sustain to us; unless our minds are blinded by wickedness, we cannot help perceiving that all the moral virtues are *right*. They grow out of our mutual relations, and not to practise them is *wrong*. And on this basis the Scriptures place our obligations to moral virtue.

“It has been often asserted that *utility* is the foundation of moral obligation. *Utility to whom? To me?* Then indeed is the securing of my own advantage the great end. And what sort of moral virtue is this? *Utility to the universe?* Then let it be made to appear that throughout the vast empire of God no sinful thought or action was ever indispensable to the highest good. Nothing is more obvious from the Bible than that the reason why God requires moral virtue is, not because it is useful, but because it is right. He is “of purer eyes than to behold iniquity and cannot look on sin.” He could not be bribed to do this for all the universe, ten thousand times told. He requires the duties of morality because they are right, and in conformity with himself. He does not “do evil that good may come.” He never requires men to do what is wrong, even

though he foresees in many instances, that their sinful conduct may be turned to the best account. It is utterly immoral to make *utility* the foundation of moral obligation, and to assign either the direct or indirect tendency of an action to promote happiness, as the reason why it *ought* to be performed. Moral virtue has a nature besides its tendency to happiness. Just as truth differs essentially and immutably from falsehood, just as light differs from darkness, and sweet from bitter, does good differ from evil. No law can confound them; no beneficial tendency of the one, or of the other can alter their nature; but like the nature of the Deity, they will remain forever the same. To make utility the foundation of moral virtue, seems to my mind to tear up all the foundations of moral virtue itself. Virtue is no longer virtue, and vice is no longer vice, if this theory be true. If this theory were true, then, if in view of the divine mind, vice is expedient, it is no longer vice; and if virtue is inexpedient, it is no longer virtue. And what wonder if men should abuse this reasoning, put themselves in the place of God, and decide that to be virtue which promotes their happiness, and that to be vice which promotes their misery? There have been such moral philosophers and they are well described by the apostle as—"men of corrupt minds, supposing that *gain* is godliness." Such a morality were the most changeful and evanescent thing in the world. No matter what its pretensions, it is mere selfishness, and radically hostile to all moral virtue. If virtue is any thing, it is virtue every where and always; and if vice is any thing—any thing but a name, it is vice always and every where. The divine nature is unchanging. It is virtue—the highest virtue; and nothing in the condition of this world, or other worlds—nothing in the divine purposes or government—nothing in time or eternity, can alter its nature. And this is one reason why, when the knowledge of God was lost in the world, there were no longer any just ideas of virtue and moral obligation. How is it possible there should be a sound morality where there is no knowledge of God? There is a chasm in morals which can be supplied only by a just acquaintance with the Deity."

We have given this long extract, because we regard it as a noble avowal of a doctrine in ethics, which it has become the fashion in our schools and colleges to deny and combat; and because we are ready to maintain that none of the heresies, about which we are so ready to contend, are more radical or more poisonous, than that which the youthful Ameri-

can suck in from the pages of Paley, Bentham, Mill, and the Epicurean and Infidel philosophers of the utilitarian school.

Upon the delicate subject of Slavery, it would require us to give the whole of what Dr. Spring says, to represent him fully, and this of course we cannot do. While therefore we caution any captious reader against taking up his opinion of Dr. Spring's tenets from our statements, or from any thing short of a careful perusal of this whole lecture, we think we are safe in making the following report. The author is not the advocate of slavery: "Wherever servitude denies the slave the rights of his moral nature, annihilates his capacity of improvement, crushes intellect that would otherwise brighten and expand, subdues affections that would otherwise be elevated to the spirit of heaven, shuts out the light of truth, and binds body and soul in the chains of ignorance and death," it is denounced by the Bible. But a slavery dissociated from abuses, is nowhere so denounced. In other words Dr. Spring maintains that the relation of domestic slavery, though exceedingly liable to abuse, and though actually abused, in the most dreadful manner, is not in itself inconsistent with the purest morality, or with the claims of the Bible.

There are no portions of this volume which please us more, than when the author, rising above the tracts of mere argumentation, to the height of some great and sacred theme, poises himself in sublime contemplation, and holds us gazing upon awful truth. We could select many passages of this sort, marked by mingled tenderness and solemnity, but especially the latter. This strikes us as pre-eminently the natural vein of our author. In mere reasoning, or brilliancy, or passionate vehemence, or in the mere heaping up of authorities, others may equal or surpass him, but in that presentation of high truths which calms and subdues and awes the soul, stilling the great assembly, like the breathing of solemn music, we know not any one who exceeds Dr. Spring.

In point of external appearance, this volume is highly attractive; the paper, type, and binding, are superior to most of this class of books. One blemish we cannot but mention—its typographical inaccuracy. Such a work, if any one can, deserves careful proof-reading.*

* In merely turning over the leaves we observed errors in the following proper names alone, viz: p. 19, Shuckford, and Condillac; 20, Stillingsfleet; 48, Sanchoniathon; 52, Rembrandt; 98, Gottingen; 137, Milner; 160, Warburton; 191, Louis Philippe; 232, Great Britain; 261, Malebranche, Berkeley, Reid, Stewart; 322, Armenia; 372, Claude.

Letters to the Rev. Professor Stuart, comprising Remarks on his Essay on Sin, published in the American Biblical Repository, for April and July 1839. By Daniel Dana, D. D. minister of the Gospel in Newbury Port, 8vo. pp, 46. Boston, Crocker and Brewster.

THE title of this pamphlet expresses with sufficient clearness, the occasion on which it was written. Professor Stuart had published under his own name, in two successive numbers of the Repository, a long essay on the question, What is Sin? The Professor's answer to this question is, that sin is the voluntary transgression of known law, and consequently there is no "other sin besides actual sin," and that the scriptures do not recognize, and we ought not to use the phraseology of ORIGINAL SIN, either imputed or inherent. As Professor Stuart's sentiments on this subject were generally known, the appearance of this Essay has excited less surprise than regret. It is not that he holds the opinions he here avows, or that, holding them, he should publish them to the world, which has excited surprise; it is the manner in which he has chosen to introduce them to public notice. Mr. Stuart has always been regarded as one of the despisers of authority, in matters of doctrine, as one of the warmest advocates of untrammelled thought and free discussion. People, therefore, opened wide their eyes when they saw him make his appearance demurely dressed in the ancient robes of the orthodox Vitringa. It is not Moses Stuart, so much, (so he would have the public think,) as Campegius Vitringa, who teaches the doctrine of this Essay on the nature of sin. If I am a heretic, so is Vitringa. You cannot strike me without hitting the venerable expounder of Isaiah; not "a new divinity man, but an honest, pious, learned, orthodox Dutchman." Professor Stuart, however, has no right to Vitringa's robes. They do not become him, nor, he them, and the sooner he lays them aside the better.

We believe Mr. Stuart to be incapable of intentional deception. We do not doubt that he honestly believes that he has dealt fairly by his author, and yet it would puzzle any man to find, out of the pages of the Christian Spectator, a more flagrant case of misrepresentation. The very fact that Vitringa had one object in view, and his translator and annotator another, should have put the latter upon his guard against perverting the meaning of his author. Vitringa's object was

to consider the nature of *actual* sin; to show that it was not merely negative. It was then, and to a certain extent, still is a favourite idea with many theologians, that as darkness is the absence of light, cold the absence of heat, so sin may be defined as the absence of holiness. We suspect few persons ever heard the late Dr. James P. Wilson of Philadelphia, preach three consecutive sermons, in which he did not insist on this definition. It is this idea that Vitringa controverts. After the first few sentences his whole exertion is directed to that point. Read his own account of the matter as given in the analysis of his piece in the index. *Peccati notio quo sensu passim sumatur in Paulinis? Actuale describitur, ejusque variae definitiones examinantur. Involvit rationem legis, subjecti intelligentis liberi, per legem obligabilis. In naturam illius accuratius inquiritur, et an sit merum Nihil? Non est confundendum cum vitiositate. Commissionis natura exponitur. Et Omissionis.* This is an outline of the whole dissertation, and in English would stand thus: "What is the idea of sin every where presented in the writings of Paul? *Actual* sin is described, and various definitions of it are examined. It (i. e. *actual* sin) involves the notion of a law, and of an intelligent and free subject, capable of being bound by law. Its nature (i. e. nature of *actual* sin,) is more accurately inquired into; is it merely negative? The nature of sins of commission is explained, and then of sins of omission."

Thus it appears that a discourse which is professedly upon *actual* sin, as distinguished from original and inherent sin, is partially translated and quoted to prove that the author believed there is no other sin besides *actual* sin! And this is not the worst of it. This perversion is made in the very face of the author's explicit assertion of the contrary doctrine. Vitringa begins by making the usual distinction between inherent and *actual* sin, and then avowedly confines his attention to the latter, and discusses its nature. *Bono morali oppositum est malum morale; tam in habitu, quando vitium quàm in actu, quando peccatum dici solet; etsi Paulus per ἀμαρτίαν peccatum passim in epistola ad Romanos, et alibi, quoque, intelligat peccatum habituale, sive vitium, h. e. habitus vitiosos et damnabiles, ad quorum praescriptum irrogenitus homo actus suos componit.* This is his first sentence: "Moral evil is opposed to moral good; as well as *habit* when it is called vitium, *corruption*, as in act when it is called peccatum, *sin*; though Paul always in the epistle to the

Romans, and elsewhere also, means by ἀμαρτία *sin* peccatum habituale, *inherent sin*, that is, those evil and condemnable dispositions under whose influence the unrenewed man acts." Can any thing be plainer than this? Every man, who has ever read a single latin volume of theology, knows that the word *habitus* has a fixed determinate meaning. It is used in precisely the same sense as that in which Edwards uses the word *principle*, or other writers the word *disposition*. Thus Turretin in describing original sin says, it is not merely the want of original righteousness, but also *injustitiae habitus*. To translate therefore the words *peccatum habituale*, by *habitual sin*, without explanation, is as gross an imposition on an English reader, as could easily be practised. The English phrase means a sin often repeated, whereas the Latin phrase means, sin considered as a principle, distinct from acts. Regeneration is defined by Turretin as *conversio habitualis*. What perfect nonsense it would make to render that phrase by "habitual conversion"! What he means by it is, "Infusio habituum supernaturalium a Spiritu Sancto;" *the infusion of supernatural principles by the Holy Spirit*.* Incredible as it may appear, Professor Stuart actually seems to understand Vitringa's peccatum habituale as equivalent to *habitual sin*. "The *vitium* which he (Vitringa) defines," he says, "or rather names, appears to be nothing more nor less than the frequently repeated i. e. habitual, desire to sin, which leads to the commission of what he calls *sinful acts*, and which is itself, (in the sense in which it is here understood by him,) forbidden by the law of God." p. 277. And stranger still, in the following page, "If the matter be thoroughly examined according to the whole of his views compared together, nothing will be plainer or more certain, than that his *vitium* is as really a transgression of the divine law, (and of course an *act* of the mind,) as his *peccatum* is." Vitringa says, moral evil may be regarded as *habitus* and as *actus*. The former he calls *vitium*, or peccatum habituale; the other simply peccatum, or peccatum actuale. Here is a formal distinction at the outset of a philosophical dissertation, by one of the greatest men of his age, between sin considered as a principle, and sin considered as an act, and yet they are both the same! his *vitium* is as much an act of the mind as his *peccatum* is!

* Turretin vol. 2, p. 569.

What makes this perversion the more extraordinary is, that the very next sentence to that in which this distinction is made, begins thus: *Utrumque Joannes definivit ἀνομίαν vitium*, which Mr. Stuart correctly enough translates, "John designates both kinds of sins by the word ἀνομία." What are the two kinds of sins? Why *vitium* (or peccatum habituale,) and *peccatum*. Yet according to Mr. Stuart, they are both the same kind, *vitium* is as much an act as *peccatum* is; though the very point of distinction between the two is, that the one is moral evil considered as *habitus*, the other moral evil considered as *actus*.

So far is Vitringa from allowing that all sin consists in acts, that he asserts, *totidem verbis* the very reverse, *NON OMNE PECCATUM EST ACTUS*. He will not allow that even sins of omission should be so called. In the 8th paragraph of chapter xvi. he again distinguishes between *peccatum habituale* and *actuale*. The former he describes as *Habitus aliquis, qui malus, peccaminosus, vitiosus dicitur, qui tanquam modus suam habet entitatem in subjecto, cui inest*. That is, "Any principle or disposition, which is called evil, sinful, corrupt, and which as a mode has its being in the subject in which it inheres."

Now when Professor Stuart can persuade us, that these ancient theologians, to whose knees we moderns scarcely reach, could gravely talk of an act inhering in a man as a mode, or of innate acts, or of acts being supernaturally infused, then we shall be ready to believe that *Habitus* and *Actus* are the same thing, and that those theologians held corruption of nature, *vitium*, or *peccatum habituale* to be an act. Until he is prepared to do all this, we respectfully hope he may let "the honest, pious, learned Dutchman" alone, and allow the new divinity to stand on its own bottom.

Mr. Stuart does not properly appreciate the responsibility which he assumes in undertaking to present the opinions of a distinguished man, in order to give authority to his own views. He will not even take the trouble to translate correctly. The sentence: *Peccatum in actu quod dicitur, habituali natura et tempore prius, phrasi scripturae rectè quis definiat per παράβασιν τοῦ νόμου*, he renders "Habitual sin, in the order of nature and time, precedes sin in act, which may be scripturally defined παράβασις τοῦ νόμου, or a violation of the divine law." This is as wrong as it possibly could be, for it is the very reverse of what Vitringa says. Instead of saying "Habitual sin, in the order of nature and time, precedes

sin in act," he says just the opposite, "Sin in act, as it is called, in the order of nature and time, precedes habitual sin." This shows with how little attention he read the author whom he attempts to expound. This oversight is the more remarkable, since according to his view of the matter, it makes the statement of Vitranga perfectly absurd. According to him Vitranga's *vitium* or *peccatum habituale* is itself an act, and consequently he makes his author say, Sin in act precedes sin in act. Having gotten the "learned Dutchman" into this absurdity, he endeavours to get him out of it, by saying that in "common parlance" we distinguish between the inclination or desire to sin, and the act itself. Common parlance indeed! What has common parlance to do with a strictly philosophical dissertation, beginning with accurate distinctions, and formal definitions, and which is so abstruse that Professor Stuart does not pretend to understand some of its parts, and doubts whether even Coleridge could be more transcendental.* Vitranga needs no such lame apology. He is not guilty of the absurdity of saying that the often repeated desires or inclinations of the mind are not acts, or of distinguishing between these desires and acts, since ninety nine hundredths of all actual sin consist in these very desires. His distinction is the common one between sin in principle and sin in act; between inherent corruption and actual transgression. The latter in the order of nature and time preceded the former. Our nature was not originally corrupt; it became corrupt. It was by the transgression of Adam that this *vitium* has pervaded our whole system, and as a *habitus innatus* renders us indisposed to all good and prone to all evil.

In another dissertation, (*Observationes Sacrae Liber iii. cap. 5.*) Vitranga thus states his views on this subject. "Notatur, quod scriptores sacri, et praesertim quidem Paulus Apostolus, vitiositatem, cum qua homo post peccatum nascitur, vocare soleant ἐπιθυμίαν *concupiscentiam*. "It is noted, that the sacred writers, and especially the apostle Paul, call that corruption with which man since the fall is born, ἐπιθυμία *concupiscence*." Such is the first sentence of the heading of the chapter. This *concupiscence* he says, "belongs to human nature since the fall:" *communis humanae naturae*

* Mr. Stuart says in reference to a long quotation from Poirer, the author whom Vitranga is particularly engaged in answering, that he does not translate it, because he is utterly unable to do so, not understanding what he says, nor whereof he affirms, p. 275.

post peccatum. After quoting a few scriptural examples of the use of the word, he adds, *Quod concupiscentia in his testimoniis non tantum proponatur ut peccatum, sed etiam ut fons et origo omnis peccati, ex levissima eorum consideratione clarum est. i. e.* "That concupiscence, in these passages, is not only represented as sin, but as the fountain and origin of all sin, is clear from the slightest consideration of them." This vitiosity or corruption then, according to Vitranga, with which man is born, is not only sin, but the fountain of all sin. Does Mr. Stuart believe that man is born with an act?

We believe that every body who knows Mr. Stuart, loves him; and if he would but confine himself to his proper sphere, every body would admire him. But when, forgetful of the truth *non omnia possumus omnes*, he makes excursions, at one time, into the regions of classical literature, at another, into those of doctrinal or historical theology, where he is entirely out of his latitude, *et ubique hospes*, he does himself no credit and religion great harm.

We owe Dr. Dana an apology for having allowed our remarks on Mr. Stuart and Vitranga to fill up the space allotted to a notice of his Letters. Criticism, however, is necessarily long, while commendation should be short. If our recommendation has any weight with our readers, we would urge them to read Dr. Dana's Letters. They are what they were meant to be; a testimony courteous and faithful against some of the dangerous positions assumed in Professor Stuart's Essay. We rejoice in all such warnings, for they are greatly needed; and those men who have the interests of evangelical religion at heart, are bound to come out and bear solemn testimony against doctrines which the experience of fifteen hundred years proves to be incompatible with experimental godliness. It is an historical fact, that the opinions respecting original sin, which are now assiduously propagated in this country, have never prevailed in connection with true religion. Individual exceptions have no doubt existed. But it is still true that the church of God has rejected these doctrines. They have been the property of the Pelagians of the times of Augustin, of the Socinians of the time of the Reformation, of the more erroneous of the Remonstrants of the seventeenth century, and of the Rationalists and Unitarians of the present day. We do not say that no good man has ever held these doctrines. This we have no right to say. But of classes of men, we may speak; and

we call upon the advocates of these sentiments to point to any church, or community of Christians, giving scriptural evidence of true religion, in which such doctrines have prevailed. It is a sad sight, therefore, to see good men wandering, in their blindness, from the camp of the friends to that of the enemies of religion. They may retain enough of truth from education and previous experience, to save their souls; but what is to become of those who follow them? "Rev. Sir," said John Wesley to John Taylor, "I esteem you as a person of uncommon sense and learning; but your doctrine I cannot esteem. And some time since I esteemed it my duty to speak my sentiments at large, concerning your doctrine of original sin.....It is a controversy *de re*, if there ever was one in the world. Indeed, concerning a thing of the highest importance; nay, all the things that concern our eternal peace. It is Christianity or Heathenism. For take away the scriptural doctrine of redemption or justification, and that of the new birth, the beginning of sanctification, or, *which amounts to the same thing*, explain them, as you do, suitably to your doctrine of original sin, and what is Christianity better than Heathenism? Wherein (save in rectifying some of our notions,) has the religion of St. Paul any pre-eminence over that of Socrates or Epictetus?"*

* Wesley's Works, vol. 2. p. 433.

QUARTERLY LIST
OF
NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Report of the Presbyterian Church case. *The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at the suggestion of James Todd and others vs. Ashbel Green and others.* By Samuel Miller Jr. a member of the Philadelphia Bar. Wm. S. Martein. 1839. pp. 596.

This report contains the testimony, and the arguments of counsel, in this important trial, presented, as we believe, with uncommon fidelity and ability. It was a herculean task for a young man, to sit day by day for several weeks in a crowded court room, and write down from the lips of the speakers the mass of matter contained in this closely printed volume of nearly six hundred pages. Mr. Miller deserves the thanks of the church and of the public for the successful accomplishment of his laborious task. This volume is entitled to the greatest confidence. Mr. Miller had an unsullied and honoured name to preserve untarnished, when he pledged himself to impartial fidelity in the exhibition of this case, and we believe he has redeemed his pledge to his own honour and to the satisfaction of all honest and competent judges. The report contains internal evidence of the most pains-taking fidelity. Indeed, we think this effort to attain verbal accuracy, is the source of the greatest defect of the work. Oral discourse differs so much from written; most speakers are so much in the habit of indulging in parentheses, or in involved or protracted sentences, which the tones of the voice render intelligible and even impressive, that, the literal report of what they say, must appear unnatural and awkward. A great deal of art and experience are requisite to enable a reporter to retain the spirit and thoughts of an address, and yet so to condense and arrange the several clauses of each sentence, as shall free his report from those attributes of oral discourse, which cannot properly be transferred to writing. The very best parliamentary reports, are very far from being literally accurate. Mr. Miller, however, has erred on the safe side, in adhering so closely to the very words of the several speakers.

It seems rather a hard case, after all this trouble and expense, that Mr. Miller should be obliged to appeal to the courts of justice, for the protection of his copy-

right. There is another Report of this trial published by Mr. McElroy of Philadelphia, which purports to have been taken "by disinterested stenographers," and "compiled and prepared for the press by the Rev. D. W. Lathrop." With regard to this report Mr. Miller states that he is prepared to prove the following, among other equally significant facts: "Very little of Mr. McElroy's book, certainly not one third part, was taken from any stenographical notes whatever. During a considerable part of the trial at Nisi Prius, neither of the stenographers who are said to have reported the case, was present in court taking notes.

"2. His reports of the opening addresses to the jury, by Messrs. Randall and Hubbell, were, though perhaps with permission of both those gentlemen, copied verbatim from mine. The same may be said of a great deal of the documentary and parol testimony, and even of many of the explanatory remarks, which purport to be original. Nearly all the rest of the parol testimony, most of the arguments and opinions on points of evidence, with the whole of Mr. Preston's argument, are also copied from the same, more or less literally, with only such changes, as may have seemed sufficient to evade the laws of copy-right. Even typographical and other errors have been transferred.

"3. The portions mentioned were taken from the Presbyterian, though due notice was given in that paper of the fact that a copy-right had been secured; and partly from the paper book (of evidence printed for the court in Bank,) before spoken of, which was never published, though a careful injunction that no such use should be made of it accompanied each copy."

As parts of Mr. Miller's Report were published in a newspaper not protected by any copy right, and as the title was deposited, (of necessity) in the clerks office before his work was printed; and as the portions alledged to have been taken, were taken not from the volume, but from the newspaper and paper book above mentioned, Judge Hopkinson decided that the case involved grave and novel questions, which could not be determined "on a preliminary inquiry and argument," but must "be left without prejudice to the full and final hearing of the case." As an injunction at this stage would decide all these novel questions in favour of the complainant, Mr. Miller was directed to have the validity of his copy right, under the circumstances, tried at law.

However these legal points may be decided, the morality of the matter remains the same. Supposing the facts to be as above stated, and we believe no one has attempted to dispute them, a large part of a Report which purports to be from notes of stenographers, was unfairly, if not illegally taken from Mr. Miller. We are exceedingly sorry to find the name of a clergyman involved in this business.

The Teacher Taught. An Humble Attempt to make the path of the Sunday-School Teacher straight and plain. Written for the American Sunday-School Union, and revised by the Committee of Publication. Philadelphia, 1839. pp. 396. 18mo.

We have in this work a valuable addition to the Helps of Sunday-School Instructors. It is evidently from the pen of a lively and practised writer, and one

who is thoroughly acquainted with the subject. Scarcely any reasonable question can be asked, as to the nature, uses, and history of Sunday Schools; or the way to begin them, and conduct them; or the books and mode of teaching in them, which is not answered in the volume. While there may be some difference of opinion as to some specialties, we strongly recommend the book, as the only full manual for the guidance of the young teacher.

Proposals for publishing, by Subscription, a Complete Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, with an Introduction and Appendices. By Dr. Isaac Nordheimer, Professor of Oriental Languages, in the University of the city of New York, and William W. Turner.

Every student of the English Bible knows the value of an English concordance. It may be said to be indispensable. The student of the Hebrew Scriptures may be assured that a Hebrew concordance, is to him of no less importance. It is one of those books which he can hardly do without, if he intends to examine carefully the word of God for himself. As every scholar must feel this to be true, it is useless to spend time in recommending such a work as that announced in this prospectus. The only question in which subscribers can be interested, is as to competency of the gentlemen who propose to prepare the work here announced. Happily they are not strangers to the literary public. Dr. Nordheimer's Hebrew Grammar and Chrestomathy have placed him in the first rank of Hebrew scholars; and Mr. Turner is the accomplished printer under whose care the elegant volumes of his associate have been carried through the press. There is every assurance, therefore, that can be desired, that the work will be skilfully and accurately executed. That the reader may have a better idea of the plan of the proposed concordance, we give the following extract from the prospectus.

"Although the projectors of the present publication do not undervalue the difficulties they will have to surmount, yet, being aware of the daily increasing demand for this most necessary help to the right understanding of the original Scriptures, knowing from experience the strength of their own resources and the means which with the blessing of God they can command for insuring success, and sensible of the great assistance to be derived from the admirable Hebrew Concordance of Dr. Fürst, now publishing in Germany and nearly completed, they have resolved on making the attempt to produce a new Concordance that shall be adapted in all respects to the wants and taste of this age and country. With this view, it is their intention to embody in their work all that is essential in that of Dr. Fürst, and at the same time to render it as convenient for use, and bring it as much within the means of all classes of students as possible, by excluding from their plan every thing that, however valuable and interesting in itself, does not properly fall within the scope of a Concordance. Such, for instance, is the lexicographical portion of Dr. F's. work, which, while it cannot enable the student to dispense with a separate lexicon, renders the Concordance itself both unwieldy and expensive. Besides comparing with the Bible every quotation contained in the work, and rectifying the mistakes, of which there are still not a few, they will also remedy some defects of arrangement which they have discovered, and adopt an improved method of indicating the inflections of words.

"The work will be printed on fine paper in eight parts, forming one royal octavo volume of about 1200 pages, with new Hebrew type prepared expressly for the purpose. The price to subscribers will be \$1.00 a part, payable on delivery

of each, for the seven first parts; the last they will obtain gratis. As soon as five hundred copies shall have been subscribed for, the first part will be put to press; and when the whole work is published, the price will be raised. Address Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway, or the editors, N. Y. University."

Means and Ends, or Self-Training. By the author of Redwood. Hope Leslie, &c. pp. 278. 18mo. Boston, March, Capen, Lyon & Co. 1839.

The Witnessing Church. By the Rev. John Harris, D.D. author of Mammon, &c. Boston. Gould, Kenall & Lincoln, p. 90. 18mo. 1839.

Stories to teach me to think. By T. D. P. Stone, Principal of the Sabbath Seminary for Female Teachers, Andover Institution. pp. 180. 18mo. Boston. J. A. Stearns, 1839.

The School-Boy; or a Guide for Youth to Truth and Duty. By J. S. C. Abbott, p. 180. 18mo. Boston. Crocker & Brewster, 1839.

Selections from German Literature. By B. B. Edward & E. A. Park, Professors in the Theological Seminary, Andover. New York, Gould, Newman & Saxton. 8vo. pp. 472. 1839.

The Philosophy of Mind. By James Douglas, Esq. of Cavers. 1 vol. 8vo. 1839.

The Three Last Things—the Resurrection of the Body, the Day of Judgment, and Final Retribution. By Rev. Joseph Tracy, pp. 104. 18mo. Boston. Crocker & Brewster, 1839.

Truth Made Simple; being the first volume of a System of Theology for Children. By Rev. John Todd of Philadelphia. pp. 424. 18mo. Butler, Northampton. Crocker & Brewster, Boston, 1839.

The approved Pastor; a sermon at the Installation of the Rev. Andrew Goven over the Evangelical Congregational Church, of Rowe, Mass. By Rev. Amariah Chandler, p. 26. 1839.

Scriptural Improvement, or aid to Growth in Grace. By Ray Palmer, Pastor of the 3d Congregational Church in Bath, Me. pp. 239. 12mo. 1839.

The Curse upon the ground a Blessing; a Sermon by the Rev. Samuel Hopkins, Saco, Maine, 1839.

Fret not thyself because of Evil Doers; a Sermon preached on Fast day, April 18, 1839. By Rev. Samuel Hopkins, Saco, Maine, 1839.

Gradations in Algebra. in which the first principles of analysis are inductively explained, illustrated by copious exercises, and made suitable for Primary Schools, by Richard W. Green, A. M., author of Arithmetical Guide, etc. Philadelphia: printed by I. Ashmead & Co. For sale by H. Perkins.

Elements of Geology. By Charles Lyell, F.R.S. Vice President of the Geological Society of London. First American from the first London edition. James Kay, Jr. & Brother.

First Reader—Second do.—Third do.—Fourth do., for the use of Schools. By S. G. Goodrich, Boston. Otis, Broaders & Co.

Sunday Morning Reflections. 12mo. pp. 78. New York, S. Colman, 1829.

Multum in Parvo, or a brief comprehensive English Grammar. By the author of Grammar Simplified. Boston, 1839.



